

j
W.P(C)No. 256 OF 1999
.UP 10 2; Draft, smtst; -n -PA4 -dFX-NORMAL -y -e; dumbp
L.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....R
ITEM No.115 COURT NO. 2 SECTION PIL

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

Writ Petition (C) No.256/1999

NARENDRA NATH AGGARWAL Petitioner (s)

VERSUS

U.O.I. & ANR. Respondent (s)

(With appln. for stay)

Date : 23/08/2001 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.P. BHARUCHA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE Y.K. SABHARWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK BHAN

For Petitioner (s) Mr. Sewa Ram, Adv.
Mr. P.K. Manohar, Adv.

For Respondent (s) Mr. Rajiv Nanda, Mr.S.N.Terdol, Adv.
for Mr.B.K. Prasad, Adv.
Mr.K.B. Sounder Rajan, Adv.

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

L.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J
.SP2

The writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

.SP1
(N. Annapurna) (Shelly Sengupta)
Court Master Court Master

(Signed order is placed on the file.)

.PA
L.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA@@
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION@@
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

WRIT PETITION (C) NO.256 OF 1999@@
CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC

Narendra Nath Aggarwal

....Petitioners)

versus

U.O.I. & Anr.

...Respondent(s)

O R D E R@@
CCCCCCCC

L.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J
.SP2

Learned counsel for the writ petitioner states that the writ petition has become infructuous by reason of the fact that the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission is proposed to be wound up. On his application, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn accordingly.

No order as to costs.

.SP1

.....J.@@
AA
(S.P. Bharucha)@@
AA

.....J.@@
AA
(Y.K. Sabharwal)@@
AA

.....J.@@
AA
(Ashok Bhan) @@
AAA
New Delhi,@@
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
August 23, 2001. @@
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA