

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

BEFORE THE REGISTRAR S.G. SHAH

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).11060-11061/2009

PRINCIPAL, KILSWAMINI COLL.OF EDN.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.  
(With appln(s) for directions  
office report)  
WITH SLP(C) NO. 11049 of 2009  
(With prayer for interim relief  
SLP(C) NO. 11050 of 2009  
(With prayer for interim relief  
SLP(C) NO. 11051-11052 of 2009  
(With prayer for interim relief  
SLP(C) NO. 11053-11054 of 2009  
(With office report)  
SLP(C) NO. 11055 of 2009  
(With prayer for interim relief  
SLP(C) NO. 11056-11057 of 2009  
(With prayer for interim relief  
SLP(C) NO. 11058-11059 of 2009  
(With prayer for interim relief  
SLP(C) NO. 11064-11065 of 2009  
(With office report)  
SLP(C) NO. 11069-11070 of 2009  
(With office report)  
SLP(C) NO. 11071-11072 of 2009  
(With office report)

Respondent(s)  
and prayer for interim relief and  
and office report)  
and office report)  
and office report)  
and office report)  
and office report)  
and office report)  
and office report)  
and office report)  
and office report)  
and office report)  
and office report)  
and office report)  
and office report)

Date: 04/08/2010 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Anil Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Himinder Lal, Adv.  
Ms. Madhusmita Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Tenzing Tsering, Adv.  
Mr. Abhay Kumar, Adv.

Item No.43

-2-

For Respondent(s)

Mr. K.N. Rai, Adv.  
Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Ravi Kant, Adv.  
Mr. Gopal Singh, Adv.

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

In some of the SLPs petitioners have failed to pay process fee. It is disclosed at Bar that all these SLPs as

well as matter listed at Item No.36 are arising out of the same common order.

In view of such fact, petitioners in all the concerned SLPs where one or another respondent is yet unserved, are permitted to serve advance copy of the pleadings against proper acknowledgment to the concerned Advocates who have filed their appearance for such respondents in any of the connected SLP. In such case, such acknowledgment shall be filed on record and it shall be considered as proper proof of service upon such unserved respondents.

The learned Advocate appearing for the State of Maharashtra in all the SLPs confirms that they have filed counter affidavit in the first SLP and for rest of the SLPs they do not want to file separate counter affidavit and are adopting the same counter affidavit in all the SLPs on behalf Item No.43

-3-

of State of Maharashtra. They have to supply copy of the counter affidavit to all the concerned Advocates for the petitioners in all different SLPs.

List again on 4.9.2010.

(S.G. SHAH)  
Registrar

rd