

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

B E F O R E T H E R E G I S T R A R S . G . S H A H

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).20740/2004

(From the judgment and order dated 19/08/2004 in SA No.183/2003
of The HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD)

CHANDRAWATI DEVI Petitioner(s)

V E R S U S

PHOOLCHAND BIND & ANR. Respondent(s)

(With prayer for interim relief)

Date: 07/02/2007 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Bharat Ram, Adv.
Ms. Hem Lata Budgujar, Adv.
for Mr. Praveen Swarup, Adv.For Respondent(s) Mr. Rohit Singh, Adv.
for Mr. Manoj Prasad, Adv.U P O N h e a r i n g c o u n s e l t h e C o u r t m a d e t h e f o l l o w i n g
O R D E R

Mr. Bharat Ram, learned Advocate appearing on behalf of Mr. Praveen Swarup, Advocate-on-Record for the petitioner states that he did not receive the Office Report and therefore, he is helpless in stating anything so far as proceeding of present Special Leave Petition is concerned. Mr. Rohit Singh, learned Advocate appearing on behalf of Mr. Manoj Prasad, Advocate-on-Record for Respondent No.1, who has filed his Vakalatnama on 20th

December, 2004, is also complaining about the non-receipt of the Office Report.

.2.

Since on behalf of Respondent No.1 Ms. Ruby Singh Ahuja, Advocate-on-Record has filed her Vakalatnama on 23rd June, 2005 without obtaining endorsement from Mr. Manoj Prasad, Advocate-on-Record, the matter is pending for confirmation of the concerned Advocate so far as Respondent No.1 is concerned since long.

The Court's order to issue notice is dated 15th October, 2004.

On 3rd May, 2006, relying upon the submission of Mr. Joydeep, learned Advocate appearing on behalf of Ms. Ruby Singh Ahuja, Advocate-on-Record, considering him as an Officer of the Court the Hon'ble Court has accepted their words that they will file 'No Objection Certificate' from the earlier Advocate-on-Record during the course of the day and passed an order to list the matter after one week.

Thereafter, the matter was listed on 11th May, 2006, when nobody was present for the petitioner even after calling for the second time and therefore, in view of the statement made by the counsel for the Respondent No.1 that the matter has become infructuous, the Court has directed to inform the Advocate-on-Record for the petitioner.

The matter was again listed on 4th July, 2006, when nobody was present for either side and for confirmation of the status of the litigation, the matter was adjourned for four weeks.

.3.

Thereafter, the matter could not be listed before any Court, may be because of the limit of upper number of cases to be listed before particular courts.

In view of the above facts, the matter is required to be listed before the Hon'ble Court for appropriate orders.

List the matter before the Hon'ble Court.

(S.G. SHAH)
Registrar