

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

BEFORE THE REGISTRAR M.A. SAYEED

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl) No(s).924-926/2012

STATE(NCT OF DELHI)

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

RAVI KANT SHARMA ETC.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for exemption from filing O.T.)

WITH SLP(Crl) NO. 1340-1341 of 2012

(With office report)

SLP(Crl) NO. 2865 of 2012

(With office report)

Date: 04/01/2013 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s)

Mrs Varuna Bhandari Gugnani, Adv.
Mr. B.V. Balaram Das, Adv.
Mr D.B.Goswami, Adv.
Mr.Khwairakpam Nobin Singh, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. C.D. Singh, Adv.
Mr Aditya Vikram, Adv.
Mr. Chander Shekhar Ashri ,Adv
Mr S Ritam Khare, Adv.
Mr. Sudarshan Rajan ,Adv
Mr Mohan Lal Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Pradeep Kumar Bakshi, Adv.
Mr. B.V. Balaram Das, Adv.

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

SLP(CRL.) NO.924-926 AND 1340-1341 OF 2012

At the outset, I would like to point out that the office report is very vague and confusing. Registry is directed to be careful in future while preparing the office reports as normally relying on such reports appropriate

-2-

Item No.14

orders were passed by this Court in completing the stages of the proceedings.

Record has been perused.

It is pertinent to note that on the last date also, in these connected matters a specific direction was issued to the ld. Counsel for the petitioner to serve the complete set of paper books on the other side so as to facilitate them to take further necessary steps in the matter. Till date this order has not been complied with. The ld. Counsel for the petitioner is directed to supply complete set of paper books within one week failing which heavy cost would be imposed on them.

SLP(CRL.) NO.2865/2012

Again the report is very vague and confusing as it indicates that

the respondent has not filed proof of service of documents while on the other hand the ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of the parties have submitted that copy of the counter affidavit has been received by them.

The report should be in consonance with the rules framed under the Supreme Court Rules, 1966. Report seems to have been prepared in the most casual way which is highly objectionable. Registry is directed to be careful in future.

List again on 29.1.2013.

| | | (M.A.SAYEED) |
| | | REGISTRAR |

hj