

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).5939/2006

(From the judgement and order dated 21/10/2005 in CWP No. 18166/2005 of The HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT N. DELHI)

SATYA VIR SINGH

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

DELHI TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With office report)

Date: 24/01/2011 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.M. PANCHAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.L. GOKHALE

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Kamal Mohan Gupta, Adv. (N.P.)

For Respondent(s)

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

No-one is present when the matter is called out.

The petitioner is claiming promotion from the post of Driving Inspector to the post of Motor Vehicle Inspector. The said claim was rejected by the respondent No.3. Thereupon, the petitioner had approached Central Administrative Tribunal. The original application filed by the petitioner before the Tribunal was dismissed vide order dated 10.2.2005. Thereupon, the petitioner had invoked jurisdiction of the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution by filing a writ petition. The same came to be dismissed by judgment dated 21.10.2005 which has given rise to the instant petition. The order sheet indicates that no steps had been taken by the petitioner to effect service of

- 2 -

notice upon respondent No.5. Therefore, the Hon'ble Judge in chamber had passed the following order on 23.7.2010 -

"Subject to deposit of cost of Rs.2,000/-, which shall be deposited with the Supreme Court Legal Services Committee, two weeks' further time is allowed to the petitioner to comply with Registrar's order dated 18.8.2008. If the petitioner fails to take necessary steps for service of notice upon respondent No.5, the special leave petition shall stand dismissed qua that respondent."

The office report indicates that petitioner had not taken steps as required by the above-mentioned order and, therefore, the Special Leave Petition against respondent No.5 stood dismissed for default. The report further indicates that petitioner had filed proof of deposit on 29.9.2010 after delay of 53 days alongwith requisite court fees after delay of 73 days without filing application for condonation of delay in filing proof of deposit and process fee. Non-payment/deposit of requisite court fee for pretty long time after obtaining order of notice from the court, cannot be

viewed lightly.

This Court has gone through the judgment impugned and does not find any substance in the petition. Therefore, the petition is dismissed.

(Neetu Sachdeva)
Sr. P. A.

(Sneh Bala Mehra)
Court Master