

1ç1  
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 one filed under Article 32 of the Constitution of India.

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

2

and proper to allow this transfer petition. Accordingly, Divorce Petition titled as "S Pushap Sudan Versus Anita Kushwaha" \235 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

3

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

4

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;

AUGUST 12, 2016

5

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.

6

434/HMA titled as S Pankaj Dhar Versus Surpriya Dhar \235 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

7

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.

8  
 21 OF 2012 titled as S Yogesh Kumar Baldotra Versus Rakhee  
 Chowdhary Baldotra \235 is ordered to be transferred from the Court of  
 Adl. 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

9  
 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  
 O R D E R  
 RESPONDENT(S)

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

10  
 inclined to allow this petition.  
 The Transfer Petition is dismissed.

.....J.  
[A.K. SIKRI]  
.....J.  
[N.V. RAMANA]  
NEW DELHI;  
AGUUST 12, 2016

11  
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

12  
petition bearing No. 50/WGA/2012 titled as S 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

13  
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

14  
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

15  
No. 573 of 2913 titled "S Nakul Mahajan vs. Bhavika Bharti" \235 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

16  
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

17  
and proper to allow this transfer petition. Accordingly, the Petition No. 30012N/2013 titled as "SVivek Wazir vs. Gunjan Wazir" \235 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

18  
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

19  
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 "SState vs. Vivek Wazir & Ors." \235 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

20  
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION  
TRANSFER PETITION(S)(CIVIL) NO(S). 1845/2013  
TAMANA SODI PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

RESPONDENT(S)

TILAK CHOUDHARY

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 "S Tilak Choudhary v. Tamana Sodi" \235 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.

21  
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

22  
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

23

No.236/ADJK titled S Sh. Vinod Kumar v. Smt. Manju Bala \235 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

24

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

25

(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&#39;BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. SIKRI  
HON&#39;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.  
D r. 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.

26

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.

27

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) (Tapan Kr. Chakraborty )

COURT MASTER COURT MASTER

(Signed orders are placed on the file)