

ITEM NO.101

COURT NO.1

SECTION IVA

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

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 1586 OF 2004

M/S. P. DASARATHARAMA REDDY COMPLEX

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

GOVERNMENT OF KARNATAKA & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(With office report)

WITH

Civil Appeal NO. 1587 of 2004 (With office report),

Civil Appeal NO. 1588 of 2004 (With office report),

Civil Appeal NO. 4187 of 2004 (With office report),

Civil Appeal NO. 5496 of 2004,

S.L.P.(C) NO. 16117 of 2004,

S.L.P.(C) NO. 17147 of 2004 (With office report),

Civil Appeal NO. 6323 of 2004 (With office report),

Civil Appeal NO. 6327 of 2004 (With office report),

Civil Appeal NO. 6328 of 2004 (With office report),

Civil Appeal NO. 6508 of 2004 (With appln(s) for c/delay in filing SLP

with prayer for interim relief),

S.L.P.(C) NO. 22325-22327 of 2004,

S.L.P.(C) NO. 24655 of 2004 (With office report) and

S.L.P.(C) NO. 26073 of 2004 (With office report).

Date: 26/07/2005 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.K. THAKKER

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.K. BALASUBRAMANYAN

For Appellant(s)/

Petitioner(s)

Ms. Kiran Suri, Adv.

Mr. Harish Chandra Reddy, Adv.

Mr. Himanshu Bultan, Adv.

Mr. Malli Santosh, Adv.

Mr. K K Venugopal, Sr. Adv.

Mr. S Muralidhar, Adv.

Mr. Somiran Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Amit Sharma, Adv.

Mr. K G Gopalakrishnan, Adv.

2

Mr. Basava Prabhu S Patil, Adv.

Mr. A S Bhasme, Adv.

Mr. B Subrahmanya Prasad, Adv.

Mr. Joseph Pookkatt, Adv.

Mr. Nikhil Majithia, Adv.

Mr. Prashant Kumar, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Sanjay R Hegde, Adv.

Mr. R S Hegde, Adv.

Mr. Chandra Prakash, Adv.

Ms. Savitri Pandey, Adv.

Mr. P P Singh, Adv.

Mr. L K Bhushan, Adv.

Mr. R R David, Adv.

Mr. Sunil Thakur, Adv.

Mr. Rahul Prasanna Dave, Adv.

Mr. Sanjay Parikh, Adv.

Ms. Anitha Shenoy, Adv.

Ms. Hetu Arora, Adv.

Ms. Mohini Bhat, Adv.

Mr. Naveen R Nath, Adv.

Mr. A N Singh, Adv.

Mr. Brijesh Kalappa, Adv.

Mr. Pankaj Kumar, Adv.

Mr. N Ganpathy, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

During the course of hearing, our attention was

invited to the decisions of this Court in Mallikarjun vs.

Gulbarga University, (2004) 1 SCC 372 and State of U.P. vs.

Tipper Chand, (1980) 2 SCC 341. Both are 3-Judge Bench

decisions. In our opinion, the matters, therefore, call for
consideration by a Constitution Bench. List accordingly.

(D.P. WALIA)

(RADHA R. BHATIA)

3

COURT MASTER

COURT MASTER