

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).31539/2012

SANJAY K.DIXIT & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF U.P. & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for permission to place addl. documents on  
record,impleadment and prayer for interim relief and office report)

WITH W.P(C) NO. 123 of 2013

(With office report)

SLP(C) NO. 14853 of 2013

(With office report)

SLP(C) NO. 22782 of 2013

(With office report)

SLP(C) NO. 33506 of 2012

(With prayer for interim relief and office report)

SLP(C) NO. 9419 of 2013

(With prayer for interim relief and office report)

Date: 28/01/2014 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Alok Shukla,Adv.

Mr. Nitin Kumar Thakur,Adv.

Mr. Amrendra Kumar Singh,Adv.

Mr. J.P. Dhanda,Adv.

Mr. Garvesh Kabra,Adv.

Mr. Siddhant Singh Malik,Adv.

Mr. Chander Shekhar Ashri,Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. E.C. Vidya Sagar,Adv.

Mr. Ram Awadh Yadav,Adv.

Ms. Mridula Ray Bharadwaj ,Adv

Mr. Nitin Kumar Thakur ,Adv.

Ms. Sweta Rani,Adv.

Mr. Alok Shukla ,Adv

Mr. Sunil Kumar Jain ,Adv

Mr. Dharmendra Kumar Sinha ,Adv.

Mr. G. Sreedari,Adv.

Mr. Rabin Majumder ,Adv

..2/-

Item No. 59

- 2 -

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

SLP(C)No. 31539/2012

The intervention application filed by Mr. Rabin Majumder,Advocate  
is reported to be defective. Cure the defects. Thereafter, list the

matter before the Hon'ble Judge in Chamber.

It is submitted that another intervention application has also been filed in that SLP. The office may process it in accordance with the rules for listing it before the Hon'ble Judge in Chamber. It is seen that respondent Nos. 1, 4, 14 and 20 are still not served. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that they are the proforma parties who have been served in the connected matters. Office is directed to verify as to whether the above unserved respondents have been served in any of the connected matters so that service can be deemed as complete.

SLP(C)No. 9419/2013

The learned counsel for the petitioner is granted time for curing the defects by filing Spare Copy and process fee.

SLP(C)No. 14853/2013

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has filed the proof of dasti. Some of the respondents have been served. Respondent Nos. 8, 28,31 and 33 have refused to accept the dasti. The learned counsel for the petitioner seeks fresh notice against them through the District Court concerned. Permitted. Take steps. Furnish correct address of the District Court concerned through which notices are to be sent.

..3/-

Item No. 59

- 3

SLP(C)No. 33506/2012

The learned counsel for the petitioner seeks dasti as against the unserved respondents. Permitted. Issue dasti.

W.P.(C) 123/2013

Await return of notice of Respondent No.1.

It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that respondent in SLP(C)No. 33506/2012 and the respondent in SLP(C)No. 22762/2013 are same so that service as against the unserved respondents can be deemed as complete. If such of the respondents have been served in the connected case, office is directed to verify as to whether any of the unserved respondent in either of the case has been served in the other case, so that service can be deemed as complete.

Put up on 23.4.2014.

|  
|mg

|  
|

| (SUNIL THOMAS)  
| Registrar

|  
|