

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No.3093/2001

(From the judgement and order dated 07/08/2000 in CM 2154/00  
in RSA 284/1998 of the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at  
Chandigarh )

GIAN SINGH Petitioner (s)

VERSUS

PUNJAB STATE & ORS. Respondent (s)

(With prayer for interim relief)

Date : 3.9.2001: This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAJENDRA BABU  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DORAISWAMY RAJU

For Petitioner (s) Mr. Dinesh Verma, Adv.  
Ms. Suresh Kumari, Adv.  
Mr. A.P. Mohanty, Adv.

For Respondent (s) Ms. Jayshree Anand, Adv.  
Mr. G Sivabalamurugan, Adv.  
Mr. Harinder Mohan Singh, Adv.

State of Punjab Ms. Geetanjali Mohan, Adv.

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

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

Leave granted.  
The appeal is allowed in terms of the signed order.

.SP1

Charanjit

[ Om Prakash ]  
Court Master

[ Signed order is placed on the file ]

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 6176 OF 2001@@

EE

( Arising out of SLP(C) 3093/2001 )

Gian Singh

...Appellant

Versus

Punjab State & Ors.

...Respondents

O R D E R

.SP2

.....L.....I.....J

Leave granted.

On an overall consideration of the matter, the High Court should not have passed the order in the manner it has done in the impugned order.

When the Advocates were not in a position to attend the Court, the High Court ought to have been more considerate and properly exercise its discretion in the matter of grant of adjournment or otherwise. That not having been done, we set aside the order made by the High Court and remit the matter for fresh consideration on merits in accordance with law. The appeal is allowed accordingly.

.SP1

.....J  
[ S. RAJENDRA BABU ]

.....J  
[ DORAISWAMY RAJU ]

New Delhi,  
September 3, 2001