

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

IA 28 in WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO(s). 134 OF 1999

HIGH COURT EMP.WELFARE ASOCN.,CAL.&ORS

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF W.B. & ORS
(With appln(s) for directions and office report)

Respondent(s)

Date: 13/04/2007 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.V. RAVEENDRAN

For Petitioner(s)Ms. Indra Sawhney,Adv.

For Respondent(s)Mr.Pradip Kr.Ghosh, Sr.Adv.

Mr.Raja Chatterjee, Adv.

Mr.Sachin Das, Adv.

Ms.Elen Moohuri, Adv.

Mr. G.S. Chatterjee ,Adv

Mr.K.K.Venugopal, Sr.Adv.

Mr. Tara Chandra Sharma,Adv.

Mr.S.C.Ghosh, Adv.

Mr.Satish Vig, Adv.

Mr.Prateek Jalan, Adv.

Ms.Aarti Khera, Adv.

Mr.N.R.Choudhury, Adv.

Mr.Somnath Mukherjee, Adv.

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

I.A.is dismissed in terms of the signed order.

(G.V.Ramana)(Veera Verma)

Court MasterCourt Master

(Singed order is placed on the file)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

I.A. NO.28

IN

WRIT PEITITION (CIVIL)NO.134 OF 1999

HIGH COURT EMP.WELFARE ASSOCN.,CAL. & ORS.Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF W.B. & ORS. Respondent(s)

O R D E R

Learned counsel for the petitioner/applicant points out that there is some mistake in the annexure filed by the Calcutta High Court in support of its affidavit and seeks correction in that affidavit. On the other hand, learned senior counsel for the State points out that there is no such mistake, as pointed by the petitioner/applicant. We find no merit in the application. I.A.No.28 is accordingly, dismissed. However, the petitioner/applicant would be at liberty to take up the matter with the government for appropriate remedies, if any.

.....CJI.
(K.G. BALAKRISHNAN)

.....J.
(R.V. RAVEENDRAN)
NEW DELHI;
13TH APRIL, 2007.