

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

IAS 30-33 & 34-37  
in  
CIVIL APPEAL NO. 6352-6358 OF 2005

GENERAL INSURANCE CORP. OF INDIA ETC.ETC Appellant (s)

VERSUS

GUJARAT STATE CONSUMER'S PROT.& ORS. Respondent(s)

O R D E R

There is an inordinate delay of 4592, 4630, 4977 and 3052 days in filing the applications for substitution of L.Rs. of, deceased respondent No. 2 in Civil Appeal No. 6352 of 2005, deceased respondent No. 5 in Civil Appeal No. 6354 of 2005, deceased respondent No. 2 in Civil Appeal No. 6355 of 2005 and deceased respondent No. 6 in Civil Appeal No. 6357 of 2005, respectively.

No cause, much less sufficient cause, has been shown for condoning this huge delay.

Accordingly, the applications for condonation of delay in filing applications for substitution are rejected.

Consequently, the substitution applications, being barred by limitation, stand dismissed.

.....J  
(CHANDRAMAULI KR. PRASAD)

NEW DELHI,  
JULY 20, 2012

ITEM NO.13

COURT NO.8

SECTION XVII

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

IAS 30-33 & 34-37 in CIVIL APPEAL NO. 6352-6358 OF 2005

GENERAL INSURANCE CORP. OF INDIA ETC.ETC Appellant (s)

VERSUS

GUJARAT STATE CONSUMER'S PROT.& ORS. Respondent(s)  
(With appln(s) for substitution,c/delay in filing substitution  
appln. and office report)

Date: 20/07/2012 These I.As. were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRAMAULI KR. PRASAD  
(IN CHAMBERS)

For the parties : Mr. Ashwani Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Rajat Jain, Adv.  
Ms. Suman Mandal, Adv.  
Ms. S. Chaudhary, Adv.

Ms. Neha Agarwal, Adv.  
Ms. Purnima Bhat, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

There is an inordinate delay of 4592, 4630, 4977 and 3052 days in filing the applications for substitution of L.Rs. of, deceased

respondent No. 2 in Civil Appeal No. 6352 of 2005, deceased respondent No. 5 in Civil Appeal No. 6354 of 2005, deceased respondent No. 2 in Civil Appeal No. 6355 of 2005 and deceased respondent No. 6 in Civil Appeal No. 6357 of 2005, respectively.

No cause, much less sufficient cause, has been shown for condoning this huge delay.

Accordingly, the applications for condonation of delay in filing applications for substitution are rejected.

Consequently, the substitution applications, being barred by limitation, stand dismissed.

| (G. SUDHAKARA RAO)  
| COURT MASTER

| | (SHARDA KAPOOR)  
| | COURT MASTER

|

(SIGNED ORDER IS PLACED ON THE FILE)