

ITEM NO.101

COURT NO.10

SECTION XVII

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Civil Appeal No.3553/2006

DLF UNIVERSAL LTD.

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

A. PRABHAKAR AND ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With appln.(s) for directions and impleadment and office report)

WITH C.A. Nos.5739-5740/2008

(With C.A. Nos.5741-5742/2008)

Date : 07/10/2015 These appeals were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.Y. EQBAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. NAGAPPAN

Counsel for the parties

Dr. A.M. Singhvi, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Ravinder Narain, Adv.

Mr. Pravin Bahadur, Adv.

Ms. Kanika Gomber, Adv.

Mr. Sidharth Banthia, Adv.

Mr. Amit Aggarwal, Adv.

Mr. Rajan Narain, Adv.

Mr. M.L. Lahoty, Adv.

Mr. Paban K. Sharma, Adv.

Ms. Roshnii Chatterjee, Adv.

Mr. Gagan Gupta, Adv.

Mr. H. K. Puri, Adv.

Mrs. Priya Puri, Adv.

Mr. Ranjay Kr. Dubey, Adv.

Ms. Arti Singh, Adv.

Ms. Sumita Hazarika, Adv.

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, Adv.

Mr. T. Gopal, Adv.

Mr. Senthil Jagadeesan, Adv.

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

On 29.09.2015, the parties were directed to settle their dispute.

Today, Dr. A.M. Singhvi, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the appellant and Mr. M.L. Lahoty, learned counsel appearing for respondent no.1 (Brig. Madan Singh) in CA No.5741/2008 (arising out of CA Nos.5741-5742/2008, jointly submit that the dispute has been settled so far as said respondent no.1 is concerned. Dr. Singhvi, learned Senior Counsel, further submits that the appellant does not want to press this appeal as against the said respondent no.1 (Brig. Madan Singh). Hence, Civil Appeal No.5741/2008 is dismissed as against respondent no.1 (Brig. Madan Singh), as not pressed.

Dr. Singhvi, learned Senior Counsel for the appellant, further submits that out of the total respondents, only ten respondents have entered appearance and the remaining respondents have not appeared despite service of show cause notice.

Liberty is further given to the appellant as also the other respondents who have entered appearance in the matters to get their dispute resolved through mediation.

Dr. Singhvi, learned Senior Counsel for the appellant, submits that these matters may be referred to the Supreme Court Mediation Centre. Learned counsel appearing for those ten respondents have no objection in case these matters could be resolved through mediation.

In view of the aforesaid facts, we refer these matters to the Supreme Court Mediation Centre and direct the parties to appear before the Mediation Centre on 02.12.2015. The Mediator would endeavour to explore the possibility of an amicable settlement between the parties and send the Report to this Court.

List the matters on receipt of Mediation Report.

It goes without saying that the non-appearing respondents, if so desired, may also join the mediation.

(Sanjay Kumar-II)
Court Master

(Indu Pokhriyal)
Court Master