

0/

R.P(C)No. 633-634 OF 2001
ITEM NO. 301
(at 3.30 P.M.)

COURT NO. 4

SECTION IV

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

REVIEW PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 633-634 OF 2001@@
EE
IN
CIVIL APPEAL NO. 1558-1559 OF 2001(For Prel. Directions)@@
EE

State of Punjab & Ors. Petitioners

Versus

Bhajan Singh & Anr. Respondents
(With Appln(s). for permission to place addl. documents on record)

with

W.P.(C) No. 282/2001 (For Prel. Hearing)
(With Office Report)

Date : 04/09/2001 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.T. THOMAS
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.P. SETHI

For Petitioner (s) Mr. K.N. Rawal,Adv.
in 633-634/01 Mr. R.S. Suri,Adv.
Mr. Vinay Shailendra,Adv.
Mr. Jagjit Singh Chhabra,Adv.

in 282/01 Mr. V.R. Reddy,Sr.Adv.
Mr. Ranbir Singh Yadav,Adv.
Mr. V.K. Shailendra,Adv.
Mr. Ajay Kumar,Adv.

For Respondent (s)

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

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J.

.SP2

Review Petitions and Writ Petition are disposed of in
terms of the signed order.

.SP1

(N.K. Goel) (H.K. Bhatia)
Court Master Court Master
(Signed order is placed on the file)

.PA
.PL58

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION (Civil) 633-634 of 2001@@
EE

IN

CIVIL APPEAL Nos. 1558-1559 of 2001@@
EE

State of Punjab & Ors. ..Petitioners

Vs.

Bhajan Singh & Anr. ..Respondent

WITH

WRIT PETITION (Civil) 282 of 2001@@
EE

N.K. Arora ..Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab & Anr. ..Respondents

O R D E R@@
EEEEEEEEEE

REVIEW PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 633-634 OF 2001 IN@@
EE

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 1558-1559 OF 2001@@
EE

.SP2

We are dismissing review petitions as the only prayer pressed in the review petitions is regarding the observations made as against the then Principal Secretary of Local Government Department who was respondent No. 1 in the High Court. Now that Principal Secretary has filed a writ petition for expunging the said remarks. Hence, it is unnecessary for us to consider the review petitions. We, therefore, dispose of these review petitions without prejudice to the contentions made by the petitioners in the writ petition.

..2/-

:2:

WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) No. 282/2001@@
EE

Mr. V.R. Reddy, learned senior counsel arguing for the petitioner - N.K. Arora submitted that the petitioner was not personally made a party in the special leave petitions which finally resulted in the Judgment containing observations which the petitioner seeks to get expunged. We have noticed that the Principal Secretary, Local Bodies was one of the petitioner in the special leave petitions. It may be that N.K. Arora - petitioner in the writ petition was not then holding the post. We are not entering upon any finding in

that regard. All the remarks we made were on the merits on the action taken by the Principal Secretary, Local Bodies whoever occupied the office then. If petitioner is entitled to get any relief in respect of any departmental steps pursuant to the Judgment of this Court or for any other relief relating to that Judgment it is for him to approach the Government to afford such reliefs on the strength of any notings made in the file concerned. We dismiss this writ petition without prejudice to the said right in approaching the Government in that behalf.

.SP1

.....J.@@
BB
(K.T. THOMAS)@@
BB

.....J.@@
BB
(R.P. SETHI)@@
BB
NEW DELHI@@
BBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBB
SEPTEMBER 4, 2001 @@
BBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBBB
.PA