

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CRL.) NO(s). 6160-6164 OF 2011

M/S SHARP EYE DETECTIVE SERVICES & ANR ..PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

E.S.I CORP.& ANR

...RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Having regard to the concurrent finding recorded by the High Court on the basis of the evidence on record, we do not find it is a fit case for our interference with regard to the conviction and sentence. However, the sentence imposed upon petitioner No. 2 by passing a common order in all the cases initiated against him, we modify the operative portion of the order only to the extent that sentences imposed upon petitioner No. 2 shall run concurrently.

With the aforesaid modification to the operative portion of the impugned order, these special leave petitions are disposed of.

.....J.
(V. GOPALA GOWDA)

.....J.
(C. NAGAPPAN)

NEW DELHI,
NOVEMBER 24, 2014

ITEM NO.5

COURT NO.11

SECTION IIA

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 (Crl.) No(s).
6160-6164/2011

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 24/06/2011 in CRLRA No. 4/2011, CRLRA No. 5/2011, CRLRA No. 6/2011, CRLRA No. 7/2011 and CRLRA No. 8/2011 passed by the High Court of Bombay at Goa)

M/S SHARP EYE DETECTIVE SERVICES & ANR

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

E.S.I CORP. & ANR

Respondent(s)

(With appln. (s) for extension of time and permission to file additional documents and suspension of sentence and office report)

Date : 24/11/2014 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. GOPALA GOWDA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. NAGAPPAN

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Subramonium Prasad, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. V. Madhukar, Adv.
Ms. Anvita Cowshish, Adv.
Mr. Mohit D. Ram, Adv.

Mr. Shrish Kumar Misra, Adv.

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

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Having regard to the concurrent finding recorded by the High Court on the basis of evidence on record, we do not find it is a fit case for our interference with regard to the conviction. However, the sentence imposed upon petitioner No. 2 by passing a common order in all the cases initiated against him, we only modify the operative portion of the order only to the extent

that sentences imposed upon petitioner No. 2 shall run concurrently.

With the aforesaid modification to the operative portion of the impugned order, these special leave petitions are disposed of.

(S. K. RAKHEJA)
COURT MASTER

(MALA KUMARI SHARMA)
COURT MASTER

(Signed order is placed on the file)