

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).13991/2005

(From the judgement and order dated 06/09/2004 in                      SWP No.  
1463/2004 of The HIGH COURT OF J & K AT JAMMU)

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

VIJAY KUMAR AND ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for c/delay in filing SLP and prayer for interim  
relief and office report ) )

Date: 03/01/2011            This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.S. SIRPURKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.S. THAKUR

For Petitioner(s)            Mr.    P.P.Tripathi,ASG,  
   Mr.    Amey Nargolkar, Adv.  
   Ms.    Arti Gupta, adv.  
   Mr.    Avneesh Arputham, adv.  
   Mrs    Anil Katiyar,Adv.

For Respondent(s)            Dr. Krishan Singh Chauhan,Adv.  
   Mr. Ramesh Kumar, Adv.  
   Mr. Kartar Singh, Adv.  
   Mr.Tej Singh Varun, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Delay condoned.

Leave granted.

The appeal is dismissed in terms of the signed order.

(Shashi Sareen)

Court Master

(Shashi Bala Vij)

Court Master

(Signed order is placed on the file)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 24 OF 2011

[ARISING OUT OF S.L.P. (C) NO. 13991 OF 2005 ]

UNION OF INDIA & OTHERS

...APPELLANTS

VERSUS

VIJAY KUMAR AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

1.    Delay condoned.
2.    Leave granted.
3.    Mr. P.P. Tripathi, learned Additional Solicitor General

appearing on behalf of the petitioners very fairly makes a statement after examining the affidavit dated 11.12.2010 filed by respondent No. 8 that similar relief has been granted to similarly placed persons on the basis of this Court's order dated 4.12.2001 in W.P. (C) No. 484 of 1998 Balbir Singh & another vs. Union of India and others and there would be no question of continuing with the present appeal and the same would have to be dismissed.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents states that the respondents will not claim more than what they have already received for the past since the impugned order is complied with fully.

5. In view of the above, we do not propose to interfere in the matter. The appeal is, accordingly, dismissed.

.....J.  
[ V.S. SIRPURKAR ]

.....J.  
[ T.S. THAKUR ]

NEW DELHI  
JANUARY 3, 2011.