

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 H.B. PRABHAKARA SASTRY

CIVIL APPEAL NO.1780/2008

DENTAL COUNCIL OF INDIA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

ARTI ANEJA AND ORS.
(with office report)
Civil Appeal NO. 1748 of 2008
(With office report)

Respondent(s)

Date: 29/09/2011 This Appeal was called on for hearing today.

For Appellant(s)

Ms. Surbhi Mehta, Adv.
Mr. Abhinav Mukerji, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. N.M. Popli, Adv.
Mrs.B.Sunita Rao, Adv.

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

Learned counsel for the appellant in both the matters and learned counsel for respondent No.1 in CA No.1780/2008 are present.

The learned Advocate, Mr.K.S. Prasad, appearing on behalf of Mr. Chanchal Kr. Ganguli, Advocate-on-Record undertakes to file vakalatnama for respondent No.1 in CA No.1748/2008.
Item No.83

-2-

Learned counsel is directed to file Memo of undertaking during the course of the day. Four weeks' time is granted to him to file vakalatnama.

The office report says that the learned counsel for the appellant has not cured the defects despite its letter dated 8.8.2011.

Learned counsel for the appellant at this stage submits that since the respondents are students in this

matter, the appellants have got some difficulty in finding out their fresh addresses and confirming service upon them, for which the matter is pending. A perusal of the file and the office report go to show that the matter is not pending for such reason. Learned counsel for the appellant had already filed a letter of proof of service upon the respondents in which the office had noticed some discrepancy about the wrong mentioning of the case number and also names of the parties. The file further shows that office had also written a letter to the learned counsel for the appellant on 8.8.2011 to file a fresh letter with correct Appeal No. and cause title. Thereafter on 13.9.2011 this court granted one more week's time, as final opportunity, to the appellants.

Despite these
Item No.83

-3-

sufficient opportunities given, the counsel for the appellant has not cured the defects by furnishing the correct and proper letter.

Hence, list the matter before the Hon'ble Judge in Chambers for non-prosecution of the matter.

(H.B. PRABHAKARA SASTRY)
REGISTRAR

rd