

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

F.A. No. 20 of 2003

Central Mine Planning And Design Institute Ltd.

... Appellant

Versus

Solachand Nathany & Ors. ... Respondents

With

F.A. No. 21 of 2003

With

W.P. (C) No. 3164 of 2003

With

W.P. (C) No. 3165 of 2003

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Appellants : Mr. Anoop Kumar Mehta, Advocate

: Mr. Nilesh Kumar, Advocate

For the Respondents : Mr. Indrajit Sinha, Advocate

Order No.25 Dated- 21.09.2020

I.A. No.8274 of 2013 (in F.A. No.20 of 2003)

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

Mr. Anoop Kumar Mehta, learned counsel for the appellant submits that in view of the order dated 29.01.2004 in W.P. (C) No.3164 of 2003 and W.P. (C) No.3165 of 2003, by which it has been directed to list both these writ petitions before the Bench which will hear the F.A. No.20 of 2003 and F.A. No.21 of 2003 at the time of hearing of those cases,, this interlocutory application has become infructuous.

Accordingly, this interlocutory application is disposed of being infructuous.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

I.A. No.554 of 2003 (in F.A. No.20 of 2003)

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

Mr. Anoop Kumar Mehta, learned counsel for the appellant submits that this interlocutory application has been filed with a prayer to dispense with the filing of the copy of the certified copy of the

judgment dated 23.12.2002 but the same has been dispensed with vide order dated 22.06.2004. Hence, this interlocutory application has become infructuous.

Accordingly, this interlocutory application is disposed of being infructuous.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

I.A. No.1256 of 2003 (in F.A. No.20 of 2003)

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

This interlocutory application has been filed with a prayer to stay the proceeding of the Execution Case No.2 of 2003 till the final disposal of this appeal.

Mr. Anoop Kumar Mehta, learned counsel for the appellant submits that vide order dated 05.10.2004, an order has been passed that no coercive steps shall be taken against the appellant.

In view of said order dated 05.10.2004, this interlocutory application has become infructuous.

Accordingly, this interlocutory application is disposed of being infructuous.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

I.A. No.2333 of 2006 (in F.A. No.20 of 2003)

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

This interlocutory application has been filed with a prayer to direct the surviving respondents to furnish the details and particulars relating to date of death as also the names of the legal heirs and representatives of the respondent no.2.

Mr. Anoop Kumar Mehta, learned counsel for the appellant submits that vide order dated 18.10.2006, passed in this appeal, the substitution of the deceased respondent no.2 has already been made. Hence, this interlocutory application has become infructuous.

Accordingly, this interlocutory application is disposed of being infructuous.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

I.A. No.1956 of 2005 (in F.A. No.20 of 2003)

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

Mr. Indrajit Sinha, learned counsel for the respondent prays for time.

Prayer for time is allowed.

List this interlocutory application, eight weeks after the lockdown period is over.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

I.A. No.1255 of 2003 (in F.A. No.21 of 2003)

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

This interlocutory application has been filed with a prayer to stay the proceeding of the Execution Case No.3 of 2003 till the final disposal of this appeal.

Mr. Anoop Kumar Mehta, learned counsel for the appellant submits that vide order dated 05.10.2004 in F.A. No.20 2003 with F.A. No.21 of 2003, an order has been passed that no coercive steps shall be taken against the appellant.

In view of said order dated 05.10.2004, this interlocutory application has become infructuous.

Accordingly, this interlocutory application is disposed of being infructuous.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

I.A. No.2334 of 2006 (in F.A. No.21 of 2003)

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

This interlocutory application has been filed with a prayer to direct the surviving respondents to furnish the details and particulars

relating to date of death as also the names of the legal heirs and representatives of the respondent no.2.

Mr. Anoop Kumar Mehta, learned counsel for the appellant submits that vide order dated 18.10.2006, passed in F.A. No.20 2003, the substitution of the deceased respondent no.2 has already been made. Hence, this interlocutory application has become infructuous.

Accordingly, this interlocutory application is disposed of being infructuous.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

I.A. No.1957 of 2005 (in F.A. No.21 of 2003)

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

Mr. Indrajit Sinha, learned counsel for the respondent prays for time.

Prayer for time is allowed.

List this interlocutory application, eight weeks after the lockdown period is over.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

F.A. No. 20 of 2003 with F.A. No.21 of 2003

Mr. Anoop Kumar Mehta, learned counsel for the appellant prays for time for hearing of the appeal.

Prayer for time is allowed as the last chance.

List these appeals along with W.P. (C) No.3164 of 2003 and W.P. (C) No.3165 of 2003, eight weeks after the lockdown period is over.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)