

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).2 0 4 1 7 - 2 0 4 1 8 / 2 0 0 8

(From the judgement and order dated 1 5 / 0 5 / 2 0 0 8 in WA No. 1 6 6 / 2 0 0 6 & WA No. 1 6 7 / 2 0 0 6 of The HIGH C O U R T O F M . P A T G W A L I O R)

T E R E S I A N C A R M E L E D U C A T I O N S T Y . & O R S . Petitioner(s)

VER SUS

M A L I N I K A R K H E D K A R & O R S . Respondent(s)

(With prayer for interim relief and office report)

Date: 2 9 / 0 8 / 2 0 0 8 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

C O R A M :

H O N ' B L E M R . J U S T I C E R . V . R A V E E N D R A N
H O N ' B L E M R . J U S T I C E L O K E S H W A R S I N G H P A N T A

For Petitioner(s) Dr. M.P . Raju, Adv.
Ms. Mary Scaria, Adv.
Mr. Ashwani Bha rdwaj, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

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

As the employee has already reached the age of 6 0 years and the Division Bench has stated that she will not be entitled to any backwages, we do not consider this a fit case for interference under Article 1 3 6 of the Constitution. We, therefore, dismissed the petitions leaving open the question of law.

(Ravi P. Verm a)
Court Master

(Anand Singh)
Court Master