

ITEM NO.11

COURT NO.11

SECTION IX

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

I N D I A

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) NO...../2014
CC Nos.13536-13545/2013(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 05/09/2012
in FA No. 471/2005,05/09/2012 in FA No.472/2005,05/09/2012 in FA
No. 477/2005,05/09/2012 in FA No. 478/2005,05/09/2012 in FA No.
487/2005,05/09/2012 in FA No. 493/2005,05/09/2012 in FA No.
494/2005,05/09/2012 in FA No. 495/2005,05/09/2012 in FA No.
496/2005,05/09/2012 in FA No. 497/2005 passed by the High Court of
Bombay At Nagpur)

EXE. ENGINEER LOWER WARDHA CANAL DIV.WARDHA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

NARHARI SADASHIVRAO SHELKE & ANR. ETC.ETC

Respondent

(s)

(Office report for directions)

Date : 04/12/2014 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRAFULLA C. PANT
[IN CHAMBER]

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Rabin Majumder, Adv. (Not Present)

For Respondent(s)

The Court made the following
O R D E RIn the first round, the matter was passed over as
none

appeared for the petitioner. In the second round also, none appears

on behalf of the petitioner.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally signed by
Sanjay Kumar
Date: 2014.12.05

Perused office reports dated 27.01.2014 and 15.11.2014.

17:16:56 IST
Reason:By order dated 24.02.2014, three weeks' time was granted to
the petitioner to cure the defects pointed out in the office report
2dated 27.01.2014, failing which the special leave petitions shall
stand dismissed without further reference to the Court.

In view of the undertaking given by the petitioner, learned counsel for the petitioner instead of filing the additional documents has filed a letter dated 03.03.2014 stating therein that there is no such notification dated 27.04.2009. He further stated that the notification dated 27.04.1989 is mentioned in the impugned order for just showing that the notification is published on 27.04.1989 in Government Gazette and the details about the said notification is mentioned in Annexure P-1 at Page 31 and hence the High Court has mentioned the date of notification in the impugned order. The said notification is not required for adjudication of matter.

In view of the above, the objections pointed out by the Registry are waived off.

Hence, in the interests of justice, the Registry is directed to place the matter before the Regular Bench.

(SANJAY KUMAR-II)
COURT MASTER

(JASWINDER KAUR)
COURT MASTER