

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE REGISTRAR S.G. SHAH

CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 6470 OF 2005

JOSEPH GEORGE & ANR.

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

V.J. PAPOO & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for substitution,exemption from filing O.T.,c/delay in filing substitution appln. and office report)

WITH Civil Appeal NO. 6471 of 2005
(With office report)

Date: 10/01/2008 This Appeal was called on for hearing today.

For Appellant(s)

Mr.T.V.George,Adv.
Mr. Siddhartha Dave,Adv.
Ms. Vibha Datta Makhija,Adv.
Ms. Jemtiben,Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. M.P. Vinod,Adv.
Mr.Khwairakpam Nobin Singh ,Adv

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
ORDER

It seems that Hon'ble Court has ordered to issue notice initially on 21st October, 2005. With such order there is an interim order restraining the respondents from alienating and encumbering the property in any manner. Thereafter there is an order on 22nd September, 2007 by the Registrar's Court No.1 granting four weeks time to the appellant in C.A. No. 6471/2005 to bring the legal representative of the deceased respondent. Since it was not done, on 23 rd November, 2006 again four weeks time was granted for the same. Unfortunately, legal heirs were not brought on record till 18th January, 2007 when again four

...2/-

- 2 -

weeks time was granted. Further four weeks time was granted on the same cause and for the same purpose on 13th March, 2007.

Similarly, time was again granted on 20th April, 2007 to bring Legal Representatives of the deceased respondent.

By order dated 18.7.2007 three weeks time was granted to the appellant to bring legal heirs of the deceased respondent, as a last chance.

On 24th August, 2007 an order was passed to proceed under Order 18 Rule 30 of the Supreme Court Rules. Meanwhile, learned Advocate Mr. Nobin Singh filed application for early hearing being I.A. No.4 on 5th February, 2007 which was listed before the Hon'ble Court on 18 th August, 2007.

Thereafter matter was listed on 28th September, 2007 when no step was taken by the appellant in C.A. No. 6471/2005 for unserved respondent.

Today Ms. Jemtiben, Adv. appearing on behalf of Ms. Vibha Datta Makhija, Adv. states that she could not take any steps in absence of the Office Report.

In view of the above facts, list the matter before the Hon'ble Chamber Judge disclosing all above information in the Office Report for appropriate orders regarding non-prosecution against unserved respondents.

(S.G. Shah)
Registrar

MG