

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION
CONTEMPT PETITION (C) NO.(S).141 OF 2012
IN
CONTEMPT PETITION (C) NO.216 OF 2010
IN
CIVIL APPEAL NO.4483 OF 2003

RAVINDRA NATH TRIPATHI

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

PARAS NATH SINGH & ORS.

Respondent(s)

O R D E R

We have heard learned counsel for the parties at some length who have taken us through the contempt petition as also the counter affidavit and documents enclosed therewith including a chart that details the basis of the recovery being made from the petitioner. The explanation offered by the respondents appears to us to be prima facie logical and does not therefore leave any room for us to hold the respondents guilty for any disobedience. In the circumstances, we dismiss this contempt petition but reserve liberty to the petitioner to seek relief in appropriate proceedings, should he still feel that the recovery being made by the respondents is not legally permissible.

Signature Not Verified

.....J
(T.S. THAKUR)

Digitally signed by
Mahabir Singh
Date: 2014.09.13
12:00:40 IST
Reason:

.....J
(R. BANUMATHI)

NEW DELHI
DATED 9th September, 2014.

ITEM NO.9 COURT NO.3 SECTION XVI

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

CONMT.PET.(C) No. 141/2012
In
CONMT.PET.(C) No. 216/2010 In C.A. No. 4483/2003

RAVINDRA NATH TRIPATHI

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

PARAS NATH SINGH & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(with office report) (For Final Disposal)

Date : 09/09/2014 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.S. THAKUR
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE R. BANUMATHI

For Petitioner(s) Mr. J.N. Dubey, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Pawan Upadhyay, Adv.
Ms. Sharmila Upadhyay, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Gaurav Kumar Singh, Adv.
Mr. Manno Mehta, Adv.
For M/s Mitter & Mitter Co., Adv.

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

We have heard learned counsel for the parties at some length who have taken us through the contempt petition as also the counter affidavit and documents enclosed therewith including a chart that details the basis of the recovery being made from the petitioner. The explanation offered by the respondents appears to us to be prima facie logical and does not therefore leave any room for us to hold the respondents guilty for any disobedience. In the circumstances, we dismiss this contempt petition but reserve liberty to the petitioner to seek relief in appropriate proceedings, should he still feel that the recovery being made by the respondents is not legally permissible.

(Mahabir Singh)
COURT MASTER

(VEENA KHERA)
COURT MASTER

(Signed order is placed on the file)