

ITEM NO.33 COURT NO.R-2 SECTION XII
SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE REGISTRAR S.G. SHAH
Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).15525/2007

K.MAITHILLI Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

K.CHANDRABABU & ORS. Respondent(s)

Date: 07/08/2008 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s) Mr. V. Prabhakar,Adv.
Mrs.Revathy Raghavan,Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Ramlal Roy,Adv.
Mr. R.N. Keshwani,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
ORDER

Petitioner has to disclose the outcome of dasti service.

In view of the fact that respondent No.1 to 6 are residing in the same house and in the same village and since they have preferred the appeal before the High Court jointly as co-litigants through one advocate only, Respondent No. 3 is directed to disclose their correct address and their stand about unserved respondent No. 1, 2, 5 and 6.

So far as respondent No.7 is concerned addresses of respondent Nos. 1 to 6 is different as disclosed in the SLP, but it seems that the addresses before the High Court were the same. She was also co-litigant with respondent Nos. 1 to 6. Respondent No. 3 has also to disclose the correct address and their stand so far respondent No. 7 is concerned.

List the matter on 27.8.2008.

(S.G.SHAH)
Registrar

ITEM NO.33 COURT NO.R-2 SECTION XII
SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE REGISTRAR S.G. SHAH
Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).15525/2007

K.MAITHILLI Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

K.CHANDRABABU & ORS. Respondent(s)

Date: 07/08/2008 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s) Mr. V. Prabhakar,Adv.
Mrs.Revathy Raghavan,Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Ramlal Roy,Adv.
Mr. R.N. Keshwani,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
ORDER

Petitioner has to disclose the outcome of dasti service.

In view of the fact that respondent No.1 to 6 are residing in the same house and in the same village and since they have preferred the appeal before the High Court jointly as co-litigants through one advocate only, Respondent No. 3 is directed to disclose their correct address and their stand about unserved respondent No. 1, 2, 5 and 6.

So far as respondent No.7 is concerned addresses of respondent Nos. 1 to 6 is different as disclosed in the SLP, but it seems that the addresses before the High Court were the same. She was also co-litigant with respondent Nos. 1 to 6. Respondent No. 3 has also to disclose the correct address and their stand so far respondent No. 7 is concerned.

List the matter on 27.8.2008.

(S.G.SHAH)
Registrar