

ITEM NO.4
SECTION III

REGISTRAR COURT. 1 THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCE

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

BEFORE THE REGISTRAR SH. RAJESH KUMAR GOEL

Civil Appeal No(s). 2799-2804/2016

SUBRATA ROY SAHARA . & ORS.

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

JET AIRWAYS (INDIA) CHAIRMAN & ANR.

Respondent(s)

WITH

SLP(C) No. 5067-5068/2017 (IX)

(Only SLP 5067-68/2017 and 6565-66/2017 is to be list before Id. Registrar.)

SLP(C) No. 6565-6566/2017 (IX)

Date : 27-09-2021 These appeals were called on for hearing today.

For Appellant(s)

Mr. Gautam Awasthi, AOR
M/S. Parekh & Co., AOR

For Respondent(s)

Mr Ujjwal A Rana, Adv.
Mr Himanshu Mehta, Adv.
M/S. Gagrath And Co, AOR
Ms Surekha Raman, Adv.
Mr Akhil Abraham Roy, Adv.
Mr Vijay Valsan, Adv.
M/S. K J John And Co, AOR
Mr. Divyakant Lahoti, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel through Video Conference, the Court made the following

O R D E R

SLP(C) No. 5067-5068/2017, SLP(C) No. 6565-6566/2017

Respondent no.1 has been deleted vide order dt.14.10.2019.

Ld. counsel for the respondents pointed out that respondent no.3 is the wife of petitioner no.1 and respondent no.4 is the wife of petitioner no.2 and despite that petitioner could not serve these respondents. It is surprising for the Court also

Item No.4

that respondent nos. 3 and 4, being the wives of petitioner nos. 1 and 2, respondents could not be served. Ld. counsel for the petitioner submits that last opportunity may be given to the petitioner to serve these respondents. Request has been made for dasti service. Allowed.

Ld. counsel for respondent nos. 2,5 and 6 in SLP(C) No. 5067-5068/2017 and respondent no.5 in SLP(C) No. 6565-6566/2017 pointed out that they have already filed counter affidavit. It was also submitted that these respondents are the legal representatives of deceased respondent no.1 and counter affidavit has already been filed by respondent no.1.

Service is complete on respondent nos. 2 and 6 in SLP(C) No. 6565-6566/2017 but none has entered appearance.

An application appears to have been filed by the respondents for directions which is found to be defective. Ld. counsel for the respondents pointed out that the only defect was that copy has not been served on the ld. counsel for the petitioner. Now, the ld. counsel for the petitioner submits that copy of that application has been served on them only on their insisting for the same. That application be processed as per rules.

List again on 22.11.2021.

RAJESH KUMAR GOEL
Registrar