

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGSCIVIL APPEAL NO(S). 4217/2013

RELIANCE COMMUNICATIONS LIMITED

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

BHARAT SANCHAR NIGAM LIMITED

Respondent(s)

WITH

C.A. No. 4215/2013 (XVII)

C.A. No. 4216/2013 (XVII)

C.A. No. 4651/2013 (XVII)

(IA No. 3/2013 - PERMISSION TO FILE LENGTHY LIST OF DATES AND IA  
No. 2/2013 - STAY APPLICATION)

C.A. No. 7801/2014 (XVII)

(IA No. 2/2014 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED  
JUDGMENT)

C.A. No. 8349/2014 (XVII)

(IA No. 2/2014 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED  
JUDGMENT)

C.A. D 22764/2014 (XVII)

(IA NO. 2/2014 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING REPLY AFFIDAVIT  
AND IA NO. 1/2014 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING APPEAL)

Date : 23-01-2025 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ABHAY S. OKA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE UJJAL BHUYAN

For Appellant(s) : Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, ASG

Mr. Arun Sanwal, Adv.

Ms. Madhu Sikri, AOR

Mr. Saket Singh, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Chaitanya Safaya, Adv.

Ms. Rachna Dubey, Adv.

Mr. Mrityunjoy Roy, Adv.

Mr. Rohan Arora, Adv.

Mr. S.S. Shroff, AOR

Mr. Tejveer Singh Bhatia, Adv.

Mr. Mohit Paul, AOR

Ms. Vishakha Ahuja, Adv.  
Ms. Rangoli Seth, Adv.  
Ms. Sanjleena Lal, Adv.

Mr. Aakarsh Kamra, AOR

Ms. N. Annapoorani, AOR

For Respondent(s): Mr. Tejveer Singh Bhatia, Adv.  
Mr. Mohit Paul, AOR  
Ms. Vishakha Ahuja, Adv.  
Ms. Rangoli Seth, Adv.  
Ms. Sanjleena Lal, Adv.

Ms. N. Annapoorani, AOR

Mr. Saket Singh, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Chaitanya Safaya, Adv.  
Ms. Rachna Dubey, Adv.  
Mr. Mrityunjoy Roy, Adv.  
Mr. Rohan Arora, Adv.  
Mr. S. S. Shroff, AOR

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

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati learned ASG appearing for the appellant (Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Limited) in C.A. No. 4651/2013 states that she will have to reconstruct the case files so that she can effectively argue the matter. The appellant in C.A. No.4651/2013 is respondent in some of the Appeals. These appeals were lastly listed before the Court in 2018.

This genuine request for adjournment is strongly and vehemently opposed by the learned counsel representing the other party. When an adjournment is sought on the ground that in old appeals of the year 2013, the case files available in the office of the Advocate are lost, no Advocate should oppose the adjournment especially when appeals are suddenly listed after a long gap. This difficulty can arise in case of any member of the Bar. An advocate

is first an officer of the Court. He cannot act as a mouthpiece of his client. We grant adjournment.

The Appeals shall be listed for hearing on 24<sup>th</sup> April, 2025 (Thursday).

(ASHISH KONDLE)  
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(AVGV RAMU)  
COURT MASTER (NSH)