

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). 7187 OF 2001

SHREE JAYBHAVANI V.K.S.S.S.MARYADIT &ORS

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for intervention and office report)

Date: 10/08/2006 This Appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.B. SINHA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DALVEER BHANDARI

For Appellant(s)

Mr.Nikhil Sakhardande, Adv.

Mrs Manik Karanjawala,Adv.

Mrs V.D. Khanna ,Adv

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Shivaji M. Jadhav,Adv.

Mr. B.V. Balaram Das ,Adv

Mr. P.P. Rao, Sr. Adv.

Mr.Ranji Thomas, Adv.

Mr. V.N. Raghupathy ,Adv

Mr. A.P. Mayee, Adv.

Mr. Ravindra Keshavrao Adsure ,Adv

Mr. M.K. Dua, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

The appeal is dismissed as having become infructuous in terms of the signed

order.

In view of the signed order, application for intervention does not survive. It is dismissed as such.

(Meenu Sethi)
hardwaj)
Court Master

(Pushap Lata B
Court Master

Signed order is placed on the file

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 7187/2001

Shree Jaybhavani V.K.S.S.S.

... Appellants

Maryadit & Ors.

VERSUS

State of Maharashtra & Ors.

... Respondent

s

O R D E R

The appellants herein filed a writ petition before the High Court of judicature at Bombay, inter alia, questioning the validity of a Crop Insurance Scheme. The High Court issued Rule but refused to pass any interim order.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants very fairly stated that a circular dated 6.6.2006 has been issued in terms whereof it has been clarified that the said Scheme is optional and not a compulsory.

In view of the aforementioned circular, this appeal has become infructuous. The appeal is dismissed as having become infructuous.

However, keeping in view the fact that the matter is pending for a long time, we would request the High Court to consider the desirability of disposing of the main writ petition itself as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period six months from date.

In view of the above order, application for intervention does not survive. It is dismissed as such.

.....J.

(S.B.SINHA)

.....J.

(DALVEER BHANDARI)

New Delhi,

August 10, 2006.