

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

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

I.A. NOS6 AND 2-5 IN WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO.926 OF 1988

CONSUMER ACTION GROUP & ANR.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF TAMILNADU & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(Review Petition No.89/2001 converted into I.A. No.6 passed in I.A. No.2 as per Court's Order dated 14/03/2001, modification of Court's Order dated 18/08/2001 and office report)

Date: 12/10/2006 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.K. THAKKER

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.V. RAVEENDRAN

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Dayan Krishnan,Adv.

Mr. Nikhil Nayyar,Adv.

Mr. Gautam Narayan,Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. A.V. Rangam,Adv.

Mr. Ambrish Kumar,Adv.

Mr. A. Mariarputham,Adv.

Ms. Janaki Ramachandran,Adv.

Mr. Krishnamurthi Swami,Adv.

Mr. K.K. Mani,Adv.

Mr. M.A. Krishna Moorthy,Adv.

Mr. S.R. Setia,Adv.

Mr. Sudarsh Menon,Adv.

Mr. V. Krishna Murthy,Adv.

In-person (N/P)

...2/-

- 2 -

Ms. Shiel Sethi,Adv.

Mr. R. Ayyam Perumal,Adv.

Mr. M.K.D. Namboodiri,Adv.

Mr. V.G. Pragasam,Adv.

Ms. Revathy Raghavan,Adv. (N/P)

Ms. Nandini Gore,Adv.

Ms. Kamakshi S. Mehlwal,Adv.

Mr. A. Mariarputham,Adv.

for M/s. Arputham, Aruna & Co.,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

As already ordered on 22nd November, 2005, the question of serving of other respondents, who still remained to be served, will be

considered at the hearing since, prima facie, it seems clear that, for the decision of these applications, presence of the unserved respondents is not necessary and the learned counsel for the parties also say so. Learned counsel for the applicants in I.A. Nos.2 to 5 is not present.

The interlocutory applications are adjourned to be listed for hearing.

[T.I. Rajput]

A.R.-cum-P.S.

[V.P. Tyagi]

Assistant Registrar