

ITEM NO.48

COURT NO.7

SECTION IX

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

## RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).4987/2006

(From the judgement and order dated 13/02/2006 in WP No. 2858/2005 of The  
HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY)

NITESH ASHOK WADHWANI

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA &amp; ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With prayer for interim relief and office report)

Date: 27/03/2006 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.P. SINGH

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALTAMAS KABIR

For Petitioner(s)

Dr. Abhishek M. Singhvi, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Sanjeev Sachdeva, Adv.

Mr. Amit Bhandari, Adv.

Mr. Ankur Modi, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

for resp. No. 1

Mr. R. Mohan, ASG

Mr. R. Nedumaran, Adv.

Mr. V.K. Verma, Adv.

Mr. Sanveer Mahelwal, Adv.

Mr. Rajiv Rufus, Adv.

for resp. No. 3

Mr. Arun Jaitley, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Dushyant A. Dave, Sr. Adv.

Mr. P.H. Parekh, Adv.

Mr. Vicky Singh, Adv.

Mr. B.N. Pujari, Adv.

Mr. Sameer P. Parekh, Adv.

Mr. Lalit Chauhan, Adv.

Mr. Rohit Mammen Alex, Adv.

2

for M/S P.H. Parekh & Co., Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

There is considerable controversy before us as to whether the orders dated 10th

September, 2003 and 23rd July, 2004 were actually passed by the concerned officer and

communicated to respondent No. D. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that

if such orders had been passed, the aggrieved respondent could have preferred an appeal wherein

all these questions could have been raised.

However, to satisfy ourselves, we direct the Union of India to produce all the relevant

records which have a bearing on the question which we wish to examine.

Put up on 12th April, 2006.

Status quo in the meantime.

Dhawan)  
Master

(Rajesh Dham)  
Court Master

(Vijay  
Court