

ITEM NO.18

COURT NO.3

SECTION XI

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).31279/2010

(From the judgement and order dated 29/07/2010 in WP No.
1595/2009 of The HIGH COURT OF U.P AT LUCKNOW)

STATE OF U.P. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

DAYANAND CHAKRAWARTY & ORS. Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for exemption from filing O.T. and prayer for
interim relief and office report)

WITH S.L.P.(C)...CC NO. 17772 of 2010
(With appln.(s) for c/delay in filing SLP and office report)

Date: 13/12/2010 These Petitions were called on for hearing
today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.V. RAVEENDRAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATNAIK

For Petitioner(s) Mr. P.P. Rao, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Satish Chandra Mishra, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Shail Kr. Dwivedi, Addl. A.G., U.P.
Mr. Gunnam Venkateswara Rao, Adv.
Ms. Vandana Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Manoj Kr. Dwivedi, Adv.
Mr. Ashutosh Kr. Sharma, Adv.s

Mr. Mukul Rohtagi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. S.C. Mishra, Adv.
Ms. Prachi Bajpai, Adv.
Mr. I.P. Singh, Adv.

For Respondent(s)
(In SLP(C)31279/2010 Mr. L. Nageshwara Rao, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Kumar Parimal, Adv.
Mr. Vivek Raj Singh, Adv.
Mr. Aniruddha P. Mayee, Adv.

2

(In ..CC No.17772/10 Mr. R. Venkataramani, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Kumar Parimal, Adv.
Mr. Vivek Raj Singh, Adv.
Mr. Aniruddha P. Mayee, Adv.

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

Issue notice.

Mr. Aniruddha P. Mayee, learned counsel

accepts notice for first respondent.

The petitioner has sought interim stay of the judgment of the High Court. The first respondent opposes stating that no hardship will be caused if the employee is permitted to continue as the work will be extracted for the salary paid.

Learned counsel for the petitioners in the two matters submitted that the petitioner will pay the salary and also take into account for the purpose of terminal/pensionary benefits, the additional two years' period, in the event of their failure in these matters. In view of the said statement, there shall be interim stay of the judgment of the High Court.

We find that SLP is filed only in one of the several cases which were disposed of by a common judgment. The interim order will therefore apply only in that case.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that they are filing the SLPs in other cases. To avoid any delay and to expedite the matters, we permit the petitioner to file a single batch of SLPs in regard to all the other

petitions.

(O.P. Sharma)
Court Master

(M.S. Negi)
Court Master