

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).10023/2011

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

INDUST.CREDIT & INV.CORP.OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

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

WITH SLP(C) NO. 20529-20532 of 2012

(With office report)

Date: 10/10/2012 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s)

Ms. Anjani Aiyagari, Adv.
Mr. D.S. Mahra, Adv.
Ms. Meenakshi Arora, Adv.
Ms. Asmita Singh, Adv.
Mr. Gautam Narayan, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Ms. Asmita Singh, Adv.
Mr. Gautam Narayan, Adv.
Ms. Meenakshi Arora, Adv.
Mr. R.N. Keshwani, Adv.
Mr. M.H. Prasad, Adv.
Mrs.D. Bharathi Reddy, Adv.
Mr. A. Raghunath, Adv.
Dr. Sushil Balwada, Adv.
Mr. Anurag Kumar, Adv.
Ms. Shilpa Singh, Adv.
Mr. A. Raghunath, Adv.
Mr. Hitesh Vali, Adv.

Item no.7

-2-

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

Registry has to verify the record, in view of their statement in the office report dated 28.5.2012 so far as respondent No.28 is concerned because probably respondent No.28 is served by registered post and proper acknowledgment is found on record. Such registered notice was issued on 16.5.2011 and it was served on 21.5.2011. Registry has to verify such fact and has to disclose the correct position in the next office report, without fail, in view of the fact that relying upon the office report dated 28.5.2012, the Hon'ble Chamber Judge has on 6.8.2012 directed the petitioner to confirm service upon respondent Nos.22, 26 and 28. Whereas as on date now petitioner has confirmed service on respondent Nos.22 and 26

and if respondent No.28 is served as aforesaid, then petitioner may not require to confirm service upon respondent No.28. The learned Advocates, appearing for different parties also want to verify the status of notice and appearance of same litigant in connected SLP(C) Nos.32230-32233/2010. In any case, any of the litigant is unserved in present group of SLPs, the learned counsel for the petitioner is certainly entitled and thereby they are permitted to confirm service upon any unserved respondents in

Item No.7

-3-

this group through the concerned Advocate, who is appearing for the same litigant in the tagged SLP, without fail, before the next date.

List again on 12.10.2012.

			(S.G. SHAH)	
			REGISTRAR	

rd