

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl) No(s).3395/2006

(From the judgement and order dated 22/05/2006 & 14.7.2006 in CRLCP No.
1088/2006 of The HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD AT LUCKNOW)

LUCIEN LESAFFRE AND OTHERS

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

SAF YEAST COMPANY PVT.LTD.AND ORS

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for interim Relief,permission to place addl. documents on record)
(For final disposal)WITH SLP(Crl) NO. 3411 of 2006
(With appln. for stay and office report)
(For final disposal)

Date: 14/05/2009 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P. SATHASIVAM
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK VERMAFor Petitioner(s) Mr. Manu Nair, Adv.
Mr. Abhinav Mukherji, Adv.
For M/S Suresh A. Shroff & Co.,Adv.SLP(Crl.)3411/06 Mr. Arun Jaitley, Sr. Adv.
Mr. R.F. Nariman, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ranjit Kumar, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sanjay Bhasin, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ajay Singh, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Shilpa Singh, Adv.For Respondent(s) Mr. C.A. Sundaram, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Rittin Rai, Adv.
Mr. M.P. Shorawala,Adv.
Mr. Manish Singh, Adv.

-2-

SLP(Crl.) 3395/06 Mr. Sanjay Bhasin, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ajay Singh, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Shilpa Singh ,AdvUPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
ORDER

Leave granted.

The appeals are disposed of in terms of the signed order.

(R.K. Dhawan)
Court Master

(Shashi Bala Vij)
Court Master

(Signed order is placed on the file)
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.1060 OF 2009
(Arising out of SLP(Crl.) No.3395 of 2006)

LUCIEN LESAFFRE AND ORS.

...APPELLANTS

VERSUS

SAF YEAST COMPANY PVT.LTD. & ORS.

...RESPONDENTS.

WITH
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.1061 OF 2009
(Arising out of SLP(Crl.) No.3411/2006)

ORDER

Leave granted.

The High Court of Allahabad at Lucknow had issued notice to the 10 petitioners before it alleging that they had committed prima facie contempt of court and steps be taken under the Contempt of Courts Act accordingly. The petitioners before the High Court who are the appellants herein, have challenged these proceedings and contended that the High Court had no jurisdiction to initiate the contempt proceedings against them. As it is only at the threshold stage, we do not propose to interfere with the impugned order. The appellants would be at liberty to appear before the court through their counsel and raise all contentions, including the question of jurisdiction of the High Court, regarding the initiation of contempt proceedings and maintainability. For the time being

-2-

all these appellants are exempted from appearing in-person.

If the

appellants are found guilty of contempt of court they would be at liberty

to require their presence in court.

The appeals are disposed of accordingly.

The High Court is requested to dispose of the matters at an early date.

Parties would be at liberty to settle the matter.

.....CJI
(K.G. BALAKRISHNAN)

.....J
(P. SATHASIVAM)

.....J
(DEEPAK VERMA)

NEW DELHI;
MAY 14, 2009.