

ITEM NO.36

COURT NO.14

SECTION IVB

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

I N D I A

I.A. 35/2014 in
Special Leave Petition (Civil) No. 18941 of 2014
(@ Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C)

No(s). 18926-18942/2014)

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated
11/07/2013 in CWP No. 651/1984, CWP No. 2030/1984, CWP No.
658/1984, CWP No. 2028/1984, CWP No. 644/1984, CWP No.
652/1984, CWP No. 655/1984, CWP No. 2027/1984, CWP No.
10457/1993, CWP No. 2029/1984, CWP No. 653/1984, CWP No.
656/1984, CWP No. 1769/1985, CWP No. 571/1984, CWP No.
654/1984, CWP No. 657/1984, CWP No. 10456/1993 passed by the
High Court Of Punjab & Haryana At Chandigarh)

THE STATE OF HARYANA & ANR

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

BHARAT SINGH & ORS ETC.ETC.

Respondent(s)

(for deletion of the name of respondent and office report)

Date : 19/01/2015

This application was called on for hearing
today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. SIKRI
[IN CHAMBER]

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Birendra Kumar Choudhary, A.A.G.
Mr. Apoorv Garg, Adv.
Dr. Monika Gusain, Adv.
Ms. Anubha Agrawal, Adv.
Mr. Sanjay Kumar Visen, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Dr. J. P. Dhanda, Adv.
Ms. Raj Rani Dhanda, Adv.
Mr. Vineet Dhanda, Adv.
Mr. N.A. Usmani, Adv.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally signed by
Rajesh Dham
Date: 2015.01.31
10:40:40 IST

Mr. Pranab Kumar Mullick, Adv.

Reason:

Mr. Ranbir Singh Yadav, Adv.

Mrs Lalita Kaushik, Adv.

2

Mr. Vinodh Kanna B., Adv.

Ms. Manjeet Chawla, Adv.

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

Vide impugned judgment, a group of Writ Petitions have been decided. Challenging the judgment of the High Court, these special leave petitions have been filed.

Insofar as the applicant in Interlocutory Application No. 35 of 2014 - Indo-Swiss Time Ltd. (now known as IST Ltd.) is concerned, learned counsel for the applicant -respondent in Special Leave Petition (Civil) No. 18941 of 2014 submitted that though the applicant had filed a Writ Petition being Civil Writ Petition No. 10456 of 1993, the said Writ Petition was withdrawn by the applicant before the High Court and the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 24.09.1999. He thus submits that in the impugned judgment Writ Petition of the applicant was wrongly included. Learned counsel for the respondent has further brought to my notice order dated 17.10.2014 passed by the High Court on review application filed by the applicant clarifying the aforesaid fact that the Writ Petition had already been dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 24.09.1999. In view

3

thereof, the prayer made in this application is allowed and Special Leave Petition (Civil) No. 18941 of 2014 arising out of Civil Writ Petition No. 10456 of 1993 is dismissed as infructuous.

(RAJESH DHAM)
COURT MASTER

(SUNEET MAHAJAN)
COURT MASTER