

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).16545/2006

(From the judgement and order dated 17/02/2006 in WA No. 560/1990 & WA No. 860/1989 & WA No. 948/1989 & WA No. 1015/1989 & WP No. 4533/1995 & WP No. 10400/1990 & WP No. 10401/1990 & WP No. 10440/1985 & WP No. 13874/1992 & WP No. 13875/1992 & WP No. 13876/1992 & WP No. 13877/1992 & WP No. 13878/1992 & WP No. 16220/1992 & WP No. 17338/2003 & WP No. 19534/2004 of The HIGH COURT OF A.P AT HYDERABAD)

STATE OF A.P. & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

S.SANTHANAM & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(Office report on default)

Date: 09/10/2009 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.V. RAVEENDRAN
(IN CHAMBERS)

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Manoj Saxena, Adv.
Mr.T.V.George,Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. G. Ramakrishna Prasad,Adv.
Mr. Suyodhan Byrapaneni, Adv
Mr. Amar Pal, Adv.

Mr. A.V. Rangam ,Adv
Mr. Buddy A. Ranganadhan, Adv.

Mr. Sridhar Potaraju ,Adv
Mr. D. Julius Riamei, Adv.
Mr. Gaichangpou Gangmei, Adv.

Mr. S.C. Birla, Adv.

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

I find that in spite of several opportunities granted, the petitioner has not chosen to take steps to serve unserved respondents. The learned counsel for2.

- 2 -

ITEM NO.12(Ch.) COURT NO.4

DATED 09/10/2009

....contd.

petitioners again requests for extension of time. There is no justifiable cause for extension.

There

However, finally six weeks' time is granted to enable the petitioner to take steps to serve the unserved respondents as per the office report subject to deposit of Rs.5,000/- as costs with the Supreme Court Legal Services Committee within six weeks and producing

acknowledgment. If the steps for service are not taken within the time granted or if the costs are not deposited within the time, petition against the unserved respondents shall stand dismissed for non-prosecution without further orders.

One K. Gurucharan has filed an application for substituting himself in place of respondent No.8 Dr. T. Chiranjeevi on the ground that he has purchased the property from Dr. T. Chiranjeevi in pursuance of the decree for specific performance and, therefore, he should be substituted in his place. Misconstruing this application, the Registry has wrongly assumed that respondent No.8 has died and K. Gurucharan has filed an application to come on record as his legal representative and raised some objection. The objections are overruled and the said application is allowed and K. Gurucharan is permitted to come on record as additional respondent (instead of getting himself substituted for respondent No.8). Cause title to be amended.
(Ravi P. Verma) (M.S. Negi)
Court Master Court Master