

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 SUNIL THOMAS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).12616-12618/2010

GOVERNMENT OF A.P. & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

RAO V.B.J.CHELIKANI & ORS. ETC.

Respondent(s)

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

WITH SLP(C) NO. 12165-12167 of 2010

(With prayer for interim relief)

SLP(C) NO. 12753-12755 of 2010

(With prayer for interim relief and office report)

SLP(C) NO. 13232-13234 of 2010

(With prayer for interim relief and office report)

SLP(C) NO. 14440 of 2010

(With prayer for interim relief and office report)

SLP(C) NO. 16073-16075 of 2010

(With office report)

SLP(C) NO. 16155-16157 of 2010

(With office report)

SLP(C) NO. 30463 of 2010

(With office report)

Date: 15/03/2011        These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s)

Mr.Dushyant Singh,adv.  
Mr.R.Nedumaran,adv.  
Mr. G.N.Reddy,Adv.  
Mrs.C.K.Sucharita,adv.  
Ms.Nirada Das.  
Mr. Bijoy Kumar Jain  
Mr.Kaustubh N.Sinha,adv.  
Mr. Ugra Shankar Prasad  
Mr. Rajeev Sharma

contd....2

ITEM NO.53

-2-

Ms.Tameem Hashnz,adv.  
Ms. Promila  
M/S. Mclm & Co.

For Respondent(s)

Ms.Liz Mathew,adv.  
M/S. Mclm & Co.,Adv.  
Mr. Bijoy Kumar Jain ,Adv  
Mr. T.V. Ratnam ,Adv  
Mr. R. Nedumaran ,Adv  
Ms. Promila ,Adv  
Mr. Amit Pawan ,Adv  
Mr.Rajeev Sharma,adv.  
Mr.Chandan Sharma,adv.

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

Both sides submit that all the parties are appearing in either of the cases and notice of unserved respondents in each case has been served in the remaining cases as a party. Ld.counsel for the petitioners submit that none of the respondent remain unserved in the light of order dated 23.11.10 by parties were directed to serve notice on the unserved respondents on the counsel appearing for such unserved respondents in connected case. Office report itself shows at page No.6 that the unserved respondents in each of the above cases are either parties in the main matter. In the light of the above, it is deemed that service is complete on all the respondents. None of the respondent except Mr.Bijoy Kr.Jain seeks time for filing counter affidavit. It is submitted on behalf of Mr.Bijoy Kr.Jain that he has not been served with copies of the pleadings by advocate Mr.U.S.Prasad, Mr.Nedumaran and Mr.C.K.Sucharita.

Contd...3

ITEM NO.53

-3-

The above three counsel submits that copy of the pleadings will be served within two days and file pleadings to complete the service. No other respondent has got any grievance that he has not been served a copy of the pleadings.

In SLP(C) No.12165 and 12167/10 it is stated that there is a delay of 39 days in filing the process fee and application has been filed for condonation of delay. Delay is condoned. However, in the light of my earlier observation that service is complete, issue of process may not arise.

List the case positively on 18.03.2011.

(Sunil Thomas)  
Registrar