

ITEM NO.31

COURT NO.3

SECTION XIV

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).19575/2009

(From the judgement and order dated 18/04/2009 in FAO No.
387/2007 of The HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT N. DELHI)

ECON PURI CONSORTIUM & ANR. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

PURI INTERNATIONAL P.LTD. Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for directions and prayer for interim relief and
office report)

WITH SLP(C) NO. 21988 of 2009
(With office report)

Date: 22/07/2011 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.V. RAVEENDRAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATNAIK

For Petitioner(s) Mr. C. Mukund,Adv.
Mr. A.K. Jain,Adv.
Mr. Amit Kaseera,Adv.
Mr. Raja,Adv.
Mr. Bijoy Kumar Jain,Adv.

For Respondent(s)

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

In terms of the signed order, leaving
open the question of law raised, the special
leave petitions are disposed of.

(O.P. Sharma)
Court Master

(M.S. Negi)
Court Master

SLP(C)No.19575/2009 with SLP(C)NO.21998/2009

1

(Signed order is placed on the file)

SLP(C)No.19575/2009 with SLP(C)NO.21998/2009

2

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION(C)NO.19575 OF 2009

ECON PURI CONSORTIUM & ANR.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

PURI INTERNATIONAL P.LTD.

Respondent(s)

WITH

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (C) NO. 21988 of 2009

O R D E R

The respondent filed an application under Section 11 of the Arbitration and conciliation Act, 1996 ('Act' for short). In the said application, a learned Single Judge of the High Court made an order dated 19.9.2007 directing the Managing Director of the petitioner to appear before it to ascertain the veracity of the sub-contract. The appeal filed by the petitioner was dismissed as not maintainable by a division Bench by order dated 18.4.2009. The said two orders are challenged in these two special leave petitions.

2. This Court on 21.8.2009 had granted interim stay of the direction of the High Court directing the personal appearance of the Managing director of the second petitioner, recording submission that if the High Court so desires, the authorised SLP(C)No.19575/2009 with SLP(C)NO.21998/2009

3

representative of the second petitioner will give evidence and further clarified that the Managing director of the second petitioner will not be a witness in the proceedings. We are informed that in pursuance of it, the authorised representative appeared and he was examined by the court. Subsequently, the court has also directed the matter to be listed for evidence of the parties.

3. In view of the subsequent events, the

impugned order has lost its relevance and therefore
the special leave petitions do not survive for
consideration. Therefore, leaving open the
question of law raised, these special leave
petitions are disposed of.

.....J.
[R.V.RAVEENDRAN]

NEW DELHI
JULY 22, 2011

.....J.
[A.K. PATNAIK]