

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

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO(s). 400 OF 2006

BEFORE THE REGISTRAR S.G. SHAH

KATTUKULANGARA MADHAVAN

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

SAIDU MOHAMMED & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With office report)

APPEAL(CRL) NO. 661 of 2006

(With office report)

Date: 17/09/2010 This Appeal was called on for hearing today.

For Appellant(s)

Mr.Senthil Jagadeesan,Adv.

Mr. R. Sathish

M/S. T.T.K. Deepak & Co.

Mr.Senthil Jagadeesan

For Respondent(s)

M/S. T.T.K. Deepak & Co.,Adv.

Ms. S. Geetha, Adv.

Mr. R. Sathish ,Adv

Mr. G. Prakash

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

In Crl.Appeal No.400/2006, respondent Nos.2 and 4
are unserved.

The matter cannot be proceeded further in absence
of service upon such unserved respondents who are original
accused. The cause title shows that present petitioner was
not a party before the High Court. If he wants any order or
action against accused Nos.4 and 6 they must be properly
served, as per service record they are not now residing at
their given addresses.

Appeals are pending since the year 2006.

Item No.62

-2-

Therefore, as last chance, appellant has to take
appropriate steps to confirm the service upon the unserved
respondent Nos.2 and 4 on or before 27.9.2010.

In Crl.Appeal No.661/2006, it seems that now

appellant is no more and on verification on record it is found that appellant is common in both the appeals and he was original complainant.

In view of the above position, the learned Advocate appearing for the State as well as for the appellant has to clarify on record about their stand on or before 27.9.2010.

(S.G.SHAH)
Registrar

beena