

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

Contempt Petition (C) No. 321/2000 in Tran.Case(Civil)No.10/1990

NEWS PAPER EMPLOYEES FEDERATION, MADURAI

Petitioner (s)

VERSUS

N.R. SAMINATHAN

Respondent (s)

Date : 11/09/2001 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.N. KIRPAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.G. BALAKRISHNAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P. VENKATARAMA REDDI

For Petitioner (s) Mr. R. Venkataramani, Sr. Adv.
Ms. R. Vijayalakshmi, Adv.
Mr. R. Alagumani, Adv.
Mr. R. Anand Padmanabhan, Adv.
Mr. R. Nedumaran, Adv.

For Respondent (s) Mr. Kapil Sibal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Vijayaraghavan, Adv.
Ms. Vanita Bhargava, Adv.
Ms. Divya Roy, Adv.
Ms. Bina Gupta, Adv.

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

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J

.SP2

The contempt petition is dismissed.

.SP1

Kalyani. (S.L. GOYAL) @@
AA
COURT MASTER@@
A AAA

(Signed Order is placed on the file.)

.PL60

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION (C) NO. 321 OF 2000@@
EEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEE
IN
TRANSFERRED CASE (C) NO. 10 OF 1990

L.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....R

Newspaper Employees Federation, Madurai Petitioner

Versus

N.R. Saminathan Respondent

O R D E R@@
EEEEEEEEEE

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J

.SP2

After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, we are not convinced that there is any deliberate non-compliance with the orders of this Court which would entitle the petitioner to invoke contempt jurisdiction. Hence the Contempt Petition is dismissed.

.SP1

.....J
(B.N. KIRPAL)

.....J
(K.G. BALAKRISHNAN)

New Delhi,
September 11, 2001.

.....J
(P. VENKATARAMA REDDI)