IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

TRANSFER PETITION(S)(CIVIL) NO(S). 1343/2008

ANITA KUSHWAHA **PETITIONER(S)**

VERSUS

PUSHAP SUDAN **RESPONDENT(S)**

O R D E R

We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

Nobody appears on behalf of the respondent despite notice.

We may record at the outset that though this petition was filed under Section 25 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for transfer of a petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to the State of Uttar Pradesh, the issue arose as to whether such a petition is maintainable or not. It was referred to the Constitution Bench and the Constitution Bench has rendered its judgment dated July 19, 2016 holding that this Court is not powerless to transfer the petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to any other State and *vice versa* and such a power can be exercised under Article 32 and/or Articles 136 and 142 of the Constitution of India. Since this petition was filed before the pronouncement of the aforesaid judgment, we treat this petition as filed under Article 32 of the Constitution of India.

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by ASHWANI KUMAR
Date: 2016.08.23 16:28:38 IST
Reason:

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, we deem it fit

and proper to allow this transfer petition. Accordingly, Divorce Petition titled as "Pushap Sudan *Versus Anita Kushwaha"* is ordered to be transferred from the Court of Additional District Judge, (Matrimonial Cases) Jammu to the Family Court at Allahabad (Uttar Pradesh)

Let the records of the case be transferred to the concerned court without delay.

The Transfer Petition is allowed, accordingly.

.....J.
[A.K. SIKRI]

.....J.
[N.V. RAMANA]

NEW DELHI;
AGUUST 12, 2016

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

TRANSFER PETITION(S)(CRIMINAL) NO(S).116/2011

AJAY KUMAR PANDEY **PETITIONER(S)**

VERSUS

STATE OF JAMMU & KASHMIR & ANR. **RESPONDENT(S)**

O R D E R

We have heard learned counsel for the parties.

We may record at the outset that though this petition was filed under Section 25 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for transfer of a petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to the State of Punjab, the issue arose as to whether such a petition is maintainable or not. It was referred to the Constitution Bench and the Constitution Bench has rendered its judgment dated July 19, 2016 holding that this Court is not powerless to transfer the petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to any other State and *vice versa* and such a power can be exercised under Article 32 and/or Articles 136 and 142 of the Constitution of India. Since this petition was filed before the pronouncement of the aforesaid judgment, we treat this petition as one filed under Article 32 of the Constitution of India.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, we deem it fit

and proper to allow this transfer petition. Accordingly, the case pending before the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sopore (J & K), arising out of FIR No. 193/1990 under Section 364, 344 of RPC registered at P.S. Pattan, Sopore, Jammu & Kashmir is ordered to be transferred to the Court of District & Sessions Judge, Chandigarh who may try itself and or assign to the Competent Court at Chandigarh.

Let the records of the case be transferred to the concerned court without delay.

The Transfer Petition is allowed, accordingly.

.....J.
[A.K. SIKRI]

.....J.
[N.V. RAMANA]

NEW DELHI;
AGUUST 12, 2016

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

TRANSFER PETITION(S)(CIVIL) NO(S). 562/2011

SURPRIYA **PETITIONER(S)**

VERSUS

PANKAJ DHAR **RESPONDENT(S)**

O R D E R

We have heard learned counsel for the parties

We may record at the outset that though this petition was filed under Section 25 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for transfer of a petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to the State of Punjab, the issue arose as to whether such a petition is maintainable or not. It was referred to the Constitution Bench and the Constitution Bench has rendered its judgment dated July 19, 2016 holding that this Court is not powerless to transfer the petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to any other State and *vice versa* and such a power can be exercised under Article 32 and/or Articles 136 and 142 of the Constitution of India. Since this petition was filed before the pronouncement of the aforesaid judgment, we treat this petition as one filed under Article 32 of the Constitution of India.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, we deem it fit and proper to allow this transfer petition. Accordingly, H.M.A. NO.

434/HMA titled as "Pankaj Dhar *Versus Surpriya Dhar*" is ordered to be transferred from the Court of Addl. District Judge (Matrimonial Cases),Jammu to the Court of District Judge, Ludhiana, who may decide the case himself or assign it to a Court of competent jurisdiction.

The parties shall explore the possibilities of settlement through mediation at the mediation centre in District Court at Ludhiana.

Let the records of the case be transferred to the concerned court without delay.

The Transfer Petition is allowed, accordingly.

.....J.
[A.K. SIKRI]

.....J.
[N.V. RAMANA]

NEW DELHI;
AUGUST 12, 2016

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

TRANSFER PETITION(S)(CIVIL) NO(S). 1161/2012

RAKHEE CHOWDHARY BALDOTRA **PETITIONER(S)**

VERSUS

YOGESH KUMAR BALDOTRA **RESPONDENT(S)**

O R D E R

We have heard learned counsel for the parties

We may record at the outset that though this petition was filed under Section 25 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for transfer of a petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to the State of Jharkhand, the issue arose as to whether such a petition is maintainable or not. It was referred to the Constitution Bench and the Constitution Bench has rendered its judgment dated July 19, 2016 holding that this Court is not powerless to transfer the petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to any other State and *vice versa* and such a power can be exercised under Article 32 and/or Articles 136 and 142 of the Constitution of India. Since this petition was filed before the pronouncement of the aforesaid judgment, we treat this petition as one filed under Article 32 of the Constitution of India.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, we deem it fit and proper to allow this transfer petition. Accordingly, H.M.A. NO.

21 OF 2012 titled as "Yogesh Kumar Baldotra *Versus Rakhee Chowdhary Baldotra*" is ordered to be transferred from the Court of Addl. District Judge (Matrimonial Cases), Jammu to the Family Court, Pune.

Let the records of the case be transferred to the concerned court without delay.

The Transfer Petition is allowed, accordingly.

.....J.
[A.K. SIKRI]

.....J.
[N.V. RAMANA]

NEW DELHI;
AUGUST 12, 2016

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

TRANSFER PETITION(S)(CIVIL) NO(S). 1294/2012

DR. SONALI PIMPLE
@ DR. SONALI MORE & ORS. **PETITIONER(S)**

VERSUS

C.K.MORE
S/O KRISHEN RAO **RESPONDENT(S)**

O R D E R

We have heard learned counsel for the parties

We may record at the outset that though this petition was filed under Section 25 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for transfer of a petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to the State of Maharashtra, the issue arose as to whether such a petition is maintainable or not. It was referred to the Constitution Bench and the Constitution Bench has rendered its judgment dated July 19, 2016 holding that this Court is not powerless to transfer the petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to any other State and *vice versa* and such a power can be exercised under Article 32 and/or Articles 136 and 142 of the Constitution of India. Since this petition was filed before the pronouncement of the aforesaid judgment, we treat this petition as one filed under Article 32 of the Constitution of India.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, we are not

inclined to allow this petition.

The Transfer Petition is dismissed.

.....J.
[A.K. SIKRI]

.....J.
[N.V. RAMANA]

NEW DELHI;
AGUUST 12, 2016

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

TRANSFER PETITION(S)(CIVIL) NO(S). 1497/2012

KALPANA TIWARI **PETITIONER(S)**

VERSUS

RAJNI KANT TIWARI **RESPONDENT(S)**

O R D E R

We have heard learned counsel for the parties

We may record at the outset that though this petition was filed under Section 25 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for transfer of a petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to the State of Uttar Pradesh, the issue arose as to whether such a petition is maintainable or not. It was referred to the Constitution Bench and the Constitution Bench has rendered its judgment dated July 19, 2016 holding that this Court is not powerless to transfer the petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to any other State and *vice versa* and such a power can be exercised under Article 32 and/or Articles 136 and 142 of the Constitution of India. Since this petition was filed before the pronouncement of the aforesaid judgment, we treat this petition as filed under Article 32 of the Constitution of India.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, we deem it fit and proper to allow this transfer petition. Accordingly, the

petition bearing No. 50/WGA/2012 titled as "Rajni Kant Tiwari *Versus Kalpana Tiwari"* is ordered to be transferred from the Court of Addl. District Judge (Matrimonial Cases), Jammu to the Family Court, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh.

Let the records of the case be transferred to the concerned court without delay.

The Transfer Petition is allowed, accordingly.

.....J.
[A.K. SIKRI]

.....J.
[N.V. RAMANA]

NEW DELHI;
AGUUST 12, 2016

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

TRANSFER PETITION(S)(CIVIL) NO(S). 1573/2012

GEETA BHATIA **PETITIONER(S)**

VERSUS

MADHAV BHATIA **RESPONDENT(S)**

O R D E R

The learned counsel for the parties submit that the parties have settled their disputes amicably out of court. Since the parties have settled their disputes, the transfer petition has become infructuous.

The Transfer Petition is dismissed as infructuous.

.....J.
[A.K. SIKRI]

.....J.
[N.V. RAMANA]

NEW DELHI;
AGUUST 12, 2016

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

TRANSFER PETITION(S)(CIVIL) NO(S). 426/2013

BHAVIKA BHARTI **PETITIONER(S)**

VERSUS

NAKUL MAHAJAN **RESPONDENT(S)**

O R D E R

We have heard learned counsel for the parties

We may record at the outset that though this petition was filed under Section 25 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for transfer of a petition from the State of Jammu and Kashmir to the NCT of Delhi, the issue arose as to whether such a petition is maintainable or not. It was referred to the Constitution Bench and the Constitution Bench has rendered its judgment dated July 19, 2016 holding that this Court is not powerless to transfer the petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to any other State and *vice versa* and such a power can be exercised under Article 32 and/or Articles 136 and 142 of the Constitution of India. Since this petition was filed before the pronouncement of the aforesaid judgment, we treat this petition as one filed under Article 32 of the Constitution of India.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, we deem it fit and proper to allow this transfer petition. Accordingly, Petition

No. 573 of 2913 titled "Nakul Mahajan vs. Bhavika Bharti" is ordered to be transferred from the Court of Addl. District Judge, (Matrimonial Cases), Jammu to the Family Court, Rohini, New Delhi.

We may note that the respondent/husband is now residing in the United States of America. As such, a request is made by the learned counsel appearing for the respondent/husband to direct the trial court for a timely disposal of the case as the respondent will have to come to Delhi to defend the case.

The aforesaid request of the learned counsel is reasonable. Accordingly, we direct the Family Court, Rohini, New Delhi to fix a date after receiving the records, so on that date the respondent/husband shall be able to come to India. We further direct that the court shall endeavour to conclude the proceedings within six months from the said date.

Let the records of the case be transferred to the concerned court without delay.

The Transfer Petition is allowed, accordingly.

.....J.
[A.K. SIKRI]

.....J.
[N.V. RAMANA]

NEW DELHI;
AUGUST 12, 2016

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

TRANSFER PETITION(S)(CIVIL) NO(S).1821/2013

GUNJAN WAZIR **PETITIONER(S)**

VERSUS

VIVEK WAZIR **RESPONDENT(S)**

O R D E R

We have heard learned counsel for the parties.

We may record at the outset that though this petition was filed under Section 25 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for transfer of a petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to the State of Punjab, the issue arose as to whether such a petition is maintainable or not. It was referred to the Constitution Bench and the Constitution Bench has rendered its judgment dated July 19, 2016 holding that this Court is not powerless to transfer the petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to any other State and *vice versa* and such a power can be exercised under Article 32 and/or Articles 136 and 142 of the Constitution of India. Since this petition was filed before the pronouncement of the aforesaid judgment, we treat this petition as one filed under Article 32 of the Constitution of India.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, we deem it fit

and proper to allow this transfer petition. Accordingly, the Petition No. 30012N/2013 titled as "Vivek Wazir vs. Gunjan Wazir" is ordered to be transferred from the Court of Additional District Judge, Srinagar to the Family Court, Jalandhar, Punjab.

Let the records of the case be transferred to the concerned court without delay.

The Transfer Petition is allowed, accordingly.

.....J.
[A.K. SIKRI]

.....J.
[N.V. RAMANA]

NEW DELHI;
AGUUST 12, 2016

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

TRANSFER PETITION(S)(CRIMINAL) NO(S).99/2014

GUNJAN WAZIR **PETITIONER(S)**

VERSUS

VIVEK WAZIR & ORS. **RESPONDENT(S)**

O R D E R

We have heard learned counsel for the parties.

We may record at the outset that though this petition was filed under Section 25 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for transfer of a petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to the State of Punjab, the issue arose as to whether such a petition is maintainable or not. It was referred to the Constitution Bench and the Constitution Bench has rendered its judgment dated July 19, 2016 holding that this Court is not powerless to transfer the petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to any other State and *vice versa* and such a power can be exercised under Article 32 and/or Articles 136 and 142 of the Constitution of India. Since this petition was filed before the pronouncement of the aforesaid judgment, we treat this petition as one filed under Article 32 of the Constitution of India.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, we deem it fit

and proper to allow this transfer petition. Accordingly, the case arising out of FIR No. 20/2012 dated 06.07.2012, registered with Police Station, Rambagh, Srinagar titled as "State vs. Vivek Wazir & Ors." is ordered to be transferred from the Court of Forest Magistrate, Srinagar to the Court of District and Sessions Judge, Jalandhar who may try the case himself or assign it to a court of Competent Jurisdiction at Jalandhar, Punjab.

As far as the accused persons, mother and father of the respondent/husband are concerned, they shall be granted exemption from personal appearance through their counsel and the Trial Court can direct their appearance only on those dates when their presence is absolutely essential. The Trial Court is directed to dispose of the case expeditiously.

Let the records of the case be transferred to the concerned court without delay.

The Transfer Petition is allowed, accordingly.

.....J.
[A.K. SIKRI]

.....J.
[N.V. RAMANA]

NEW DELHI;
AGUUST 12, 2016

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

TRANSFER PETITION(S)(CIVIL) NO(S). 1845/2013

TAMANA SODI **PETITIONER(S)**

VERSUS

TILAK CHOUDHARY **RESPONDENT(S)**

O R D E R

We have heard learned counsel for the parties

We may record at the outset that though this petition was filed under Section 25 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for transfer of a petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to the NCT of Delhi, the issue arose as to whether such a petition is maintainable or not. It was referred to the Constitution Bench and the Constitution Bench has rendered its judgment dated July 19, 2016 holding that this Court is not powerless to transfer the petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to any other State and *vice versa* and such a power can be exercised under Article 32 and/or Articles 136 and 142 of the Constitution of India. Since this petition was filed before the pronouncement of the aforesaid judgment, we treat this petition as one filed under Article 32 of the Constitution of India.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, we deem it fit and proper to allow this transfer petition. Accordingly, HMA 682/2013 titled "Tilak Choudhary v. Tamana Sodi" is ordered to be transferred from the Court of Addl. District Judge, Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir to the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Dwarka, New Delhi.

Let the records of the case be transferred to the concerned court without delay.

The Transfer Petition is allowed, accordingly.

.....J.
[A.K. SIKRI]

.....J.
[N.V. RAMANA]

NEW DELHI;
AGUUST 12, 2016

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

TRANSFER PETITION(S)(CIVIL) NO(S). 14/2014

MANJU BALA **PETITIONER(S)**

VERSUS

VINOD KUMAR **RESPONDENT(S)**

O R D E R

We have heard learned counsel for the parties

We may record at the outset that though this petition was filed under Section 25 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 for transfer of a petition from the State of Jammu and Kashmir to the State of Himachal Pradesh, the issue arose as to whether such a petition is maintainable or not. It was referred to the Constitution Bench and the Constitution Bench has rendered its judgment dated July 19, 2016 holding that this Court is not powerless to transfer the petition from the State of Jammu & Kashmir to any other State and *vice versa* and such a power can be exercised under Article 32 and/or Articles 136 and 142 of the Constitution of India. Since this petition was filed before the pronouncement of the aforesaid judgment, we treat this petition as one filed under Article 32 of the Constitution of India.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, we deem it fit and proper to allow this transfer petition. Accordingly, Case

No.236/ADJK titled "Sh. Vinod Kumar v. Smt. Manju Bala" is ordered to be transferred from the Court of Addl. District Judge, Kathua, Jammu and Kashmir to the Court of Principal District and Sessions Judge, Kangra, Himachal Pradesh.

Let the records of the case be transferred to the concerned court without delay.

The Transfer Petition is allowed, accordingly.

.....J.
[A.K. SIKRI]

.....J.
[N.V. RAMANA]

NEW DELHI;
AUGUST 12, 2016

ITEM NO.38 COURT NO.10 SECTION XVIA

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

Transfer Petition(s)(Civil) No(s). 1343/2008

ANITA KUSHWAHA Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

PUSHAP SUDAN Respondent(s)

(with appln. (s) for early hearing and exemption from filing O.T. and stay and office report)

WITH
T.P.(Crl.) No. 116/2011
(With appln.(s) for stay and Office Report)

T.P.(C) No. 562/2011
(With appln.(s) for stay and Office Report)

T.P.(C) No. 1161/2012
(With appln.(s) for stay and Office Report)

T.P.(C) No. 1294/2012
(With appln.(s) for permission to file additional documents and appln.(s) for stay and Office Report)

T.P.(C) No. 1497/2012
(With appln.(s) for exemption from filing O.T. and appln.(s) for directions and Office Report)

T.P.(C) No. 1573/2012
(With appln.(s) for stay and Office Report)

T.P.(C) No. 426/2013
(With appln.(s) for stay and Office Report)

T.P.(C) No. 1773/2013
(With appln.(s) for directions and appln.(s) for vacating stay and appln.(s) for exemption from filing O.T. and appln.(s) for stay and appln.(s) for bringing on record additional documents and Office Report)

T.P.(C) No. 1821/2013
(With appln.(s) for stay and Office Report)

T.P.(Crl.) No. 99/2014

(With appln.(s) for ex-parte stay and Office Report)

T.P.(C) No. 1845/2013
(With appln.(s) for stay and Office Report)

T.P.(C) No. 14/2014
(With appln.(s) for stay and appln.(s) for amendment of the petition and Office Report)

Date : 12/08/2016 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. SIKRI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA

For Petitioner(s) Mrs. Mona K. Rajvanshi,Adv.

Mr. Vivek Thanka, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sudhir Walia, Adv.
Ms. Niharika Ahluwalia, Adv.
Dr. Abhishek Atrey,Adv.

Mr. Ujjal Singh, Adv.
Mr. J.P. Singh, Adv.
Mr. R. C. Kaushik,Adv.

Mr. Abhay Prakash Sahey, Adv.
Mr. Amit Kishore Sinha, Adv.
Mr. Himanshu Shekhar,Adv.

Mr. B.H. Marlapalle, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Kunal Cheema, Adv.
Mr. Aditya Gaggan, Adv.
Mr. Apoorv Shukla, Adv.
Mr. Ajit Wagh, Adv.
Mr. Ogesh Ahir Rao, Adv.
Mr. Yash Pal Dhingra,Adv.

Mr. Vibhakar Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Sunil Kumar Verma,Adv.

Ms. Madhu Moolchandani,Adv.
Mr. Rajinder Mathur,Adv.

Mr. Shailendra Bhardwaj,Adv.
Ms. Aroma S. Bhardwaj, Adv.
Mr. Ranjit Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Ravi Shankar Ravi, Adv.
Ms. Priyanka Das, Adv.
Mr. Debasis Misra, Adv.

Mr. Pradeep Kumar Mittal, Adv.
Mr. Anurag Kashyap, Adv.
Ms. Monak Rajvanshi, Adv.

Mr. Vipin Gogia, Adv.
Ms. Jaspreet Gogia,Adv.

Ms. Kaveeta Wadia,Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Ranjit Kumar, SG
Mr. P.S. Patwalia, ASG
Ms. Binu Tamta, Adv.
Ms. Rashmi Malhotra, Adv.
Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Ranjana Singh, Adv.
Ms. Ranjana Narayan, Adv.
Mr. Rajiv Singh, Adv.
Mr. B.K. Parshad, Adv.

Mr. Rajesh Srivastava,Adv.

Mr. Shreekant N. Terdal,Adv.

Mr. Bimal Roy Jad,Adv.

Ms. Shivali Chaudhary, Adv.
Mr. C. D. Singh,Adv.

Mr. Venkita Subramoniam T. R.,Adv.

Mr. Arvind Kumar, Adv.
Ms. Laxmi Arvind,Adv.
Mr. Pradeep Kumar Mathur, Adv.

Mr. Ashok Mathur,Adv.

Mr. Ashok Kumar Juneja, Adv.
Mr. Chand Qureshi, Adv.
Mr. Aseem Sawhney, Adv.
Mr. Dharmendra Kumar Sinha,Adv.

Mr. Antima Bazaz, Adv.
Mr. Rabin Majumder,Adv.

Mr. Ramesh Babu M. R.,Adv.

Mr. Nitin Sangra, Adv.
Ms. Pragya Baghel,Adv.

Mr. Sunil Fernandes, Adv.

Ms. Astha Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Puneethi K.G., Adv.
Ms. Mithu Jain, Adv.

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

T.P.(c) No. 1773 of 2013

Learned counsel for the respondent wants to file certain documents. Let the documents be filed within two weeks.

List after two weeks.

T.P (C) No(s). 1343/2008, T.P.(Crl.) No. 116/2011, T.P.(C) No. 562/2011, T.P.(C) No. 1161/2012, T.P.(C) No. 1497/2012, T.P.(C) No. 426/2013, T.P.(C) No. 1821/2013, T.P.(Crl.) No. 99/2014, T.P.(C) No. 1845/2013, T.P.(C) No. 14/2014 are allowed and T.P.(C) No. 1294/2012 and T.P.(C) No. 1573/2012 are dismissed in terms of the signed order.

(Ashwani Thakur)
COURT MASTER

(Tapan Kr. Chakraborty)
COURT MASTER

(Signed orders are placed on the file)