

ITEM NO.8

COURT NO.9

SECTION IIB

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

PETITION(S) FOR SPECIAL LEAVE TO APPEAL (CRL.) NO(S). 1136/2014  
(ARISING OUT OF IMPUGNED FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER DATED 05/07/2013  
IN CRLA NO. 367/2007 PASSED BY THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH  
AT SHIMLA)

STATE OF H.P

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

SANJAY KANWAR @ SANJU  
(WITH APPLN. (S) FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. AND STAY AND OFFICE  
REPORT)

RESPONDENT(S)

WITH  
CRL.A. NO. 1192/2010  
(WITH OFFICE REPORT)

CRL.A. NO. 2207/2010

CRL.A. NO. 1062/2011

CRL.A. NO. 1063/2011

SLP(CRL) NO. 1230/2014  
(WITH OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(CRL) NO. 1233/2014  
(WITH OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(CRL) NO. 1365/2014  
(WITH OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(CRL) NO. 1366/2014  
(WITH APPLN. (S) FOR STAY AND OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(CRL) NO. 1367-1368/2014  
(WITH OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(CRL) NO. 1730/2014  
(WITH OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(CRL) NO. 1735/2014

SLP (CRL) NO. 2852/2014  
(WITH OFFICE REPORT)

SLP (CRL) NO. 3223/2014  
(WITH OFFICE REPORT)

CRL.A. NO. 912/2010

SLP (CRL) NO. 805/2014  
(WITH OFFICE REPORT)

SLP (CRL) NO. 3224/2014  
(WITH OFFICE REPORT)

Date : 03/02/2015 These cases were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RANJAN GOGOI  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. NAGAPPAN

For Parties (s)

Mr. Suryanarayana Singh, AAG  
Ms. Pragati Neekhara, Adv.

Mr. Anish Kumar Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Arun K. Sinha, Adv.

Mr. Varinder Kumar Sharma, Adv.

Mr. M. P. Jha, Adv.

Mr. S.L. Gupta, Adv.

Ms. Shalu Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Joginder Singh Kanwar, Adv.

Mr. Ram Ashray, Adv.

Mr. Brahm Shankar, Adv.

Mr. Rameshwar Prasad Goyal, Adv.

Mr. Ritesh Agrawal, Adv.

Mr. Dinesh Kumar Garg, Adv.

Mr. Dhananjay Garg, Adv.

Mr. Deepak Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Himanshu Tyagi, Adv.  
Ms. Asha Gopalan Nair, Adv.

Mr. J.K. Das, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Sandeep D. Das, Adv.  
Mr. S.K. Das, Adv.  
Mr. D.M. Sharma, Adv.  
Mr. Parmanand Gaur, Adv.

Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Adv.

Ms. Nidhi, Adv.

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

This group of 17 cases will have to be heard analogously inasmuch as the issue/question of law that arises is common. We are informed by the Office that in some of the cases service is not complete. If the Court is to decide the cases where service is complete, the same may adversely affect the accused who are respondents in the connected matters where service is yet to be effected. We, therefore, direct the Office to ensure completion of service of notice on the respondents in all the cases and thereafter list the cases for hearing as a group matter.

[VINOD LAKHINA]  
COURT MASTER

[ASHA SONI]  
COURT MASTER