

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

TRANSFER PETITION (CRL.) NO(s). 219-220 OF 2009

CBI

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

HOPESON NINGSHEN & Ors.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for directions, stay and office report)
(for final disposal)

Date: 24/11/2009 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARJIT SINGH BEDI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK VERMA

Mr. Sidharth Luthra, Sr. Adv. (A.C.)
Ms. Charu Sarin, Adv.
Ms. M. Dutta, Adv.

For Petitioner(s) Mr. P.P. Malhotra, ASG.
 Mr. A.K. Sharma, Adv.
 Ms. Shweta Verma, Adv.
 Mr. P.K. Dey, Adv.
 Mr. B. Krishna Prasad, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Colin Gonsalves, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. P. Ramesh Kumar, Adv.

Ms. Kamini Jaiswal, Adv.

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

At the very outset the learned counsel for the accused as well as Mr. C. Gonsalves, the learned senior counsel for the intervenor have raised an objection that the State of Manipur has not been impleaded as a party. They also say that they have no

-2-

objection if the State of Manipur is impleaded as party-respondent on the request of Mr. P.P. Malhotra, the learned Additional Solicitor General. We, accordingly, implead the State of Manipur as respondent No.2 and direct that notice be served on the newly added respondent, returnable within four weeks.

Dasti service is also permitted.

Mr. Malhotra, also points out that the charge has

been filed against the accused-respondent but the
learned counsel for the accused states that the copy of
the same has not been served on the accused.

List the matters after service is complete.

[SUMAN WADHWA]
COURT MASTER

[MITHLESH GUPTA]
COURT MASTER