Item No.4 & 60 Court No.3 SECTION IVB

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IA No 1 In /1999 in Cont.Pet(C) 119/1999 In SLP(C)11947/1996

SURENDER SINGH & ORS Petitioner (s)

VERSUS

RANJEET ISSAR Respondent (s)
(With Appln(s). for clarification of Ct's order dt.19.11.99)
WITH SLP(C).....CC6611/2000(With appln.for c/delay in filing SLP)
(With Office Report)
Date : 06/11/2000 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.B. PATTANAIK
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE U.C. BANERJEE

For the Petitioner(s) Mr. P.N.Misra,Sr.Adv.
Mr. D.K.Garg,Adv.

For the Respondent(s) Mr. Pramod Dayal,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel, the Court made the following

O R D E R

........L.......I.......T.......T.......T.......T...................J.
.SP2

I.A.No.1: So far as the application for clarification is concerned, we have disposed of the matter on examining the records and there being no ambiguity in our order, question of clarification does not arise. Application for clarification stands rejected.

SLP(C) ...CC6611/2000: Mr. Misra, the learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioners states that though the Writ Application has been filed on a fresh cause of action and when it was proceeded the Court passed the impugned order, though the counsel never submitted before the Court that he would move the Supreme Court for clarification of the order.

Put up after 4 weeks for filing an affidavit to this effect.
.SP1

(Y.P.Dhamija) (Suneet Bala Sharma)@@
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
COURT MASTER COURT MASTER