

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 H.B. PRABHAKARA SASTRY

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).19399-19406/2010

KASTURI LAL & ORS.ETC.ETC.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for impleadment as party respondent and office report)

WITH

- SLP(C) NO. 11932-11934 of 2010
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 18231 of 2010
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 23829 of 2010
(With prayer for interim relief and office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 24614-24617 of 2010
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 24618-24637 of 2010
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 24772 of 2010
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 24817-24822 of 2010
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 25853-25854 of 2010
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 9042 of 2011
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 9043-9045 of 2011
(With office report)

Date: 26/08/2011 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.
For Petitioner(s)

Mrs.Rekha Palli,Adv.
Mr Jasbir Singh Malik, Adv.
Mr. S.K. Sabharwal, Adv.

-2-

Item No.16

For Respondent(s)

Mr Govind Goel,Adv.
Mr. Mohan Lal Sharma,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

The ld. Counsel for the petitioner in SLP(C) No. 11932-11934,24618-24637 and 24772 of 2010 are present.

The ld. Counsel for respondent No.3 in SLP(C) Nos. 25853-25854/2010 is present.

SLP(C) NO.19399-19406/2010

Await return of notice from the unserved respondents.

SLP(C) NO.24618-24637/2010

The ld. Counsel for the petitioner present and submits that the ld. Advocate, Mr Sanjeev Kumar appearing on behalf of Mr Kamal Mohan Gupta, Advocate-on-record had undertaken to file vakalatnama on behalf of respondent No.1. The same has been recorded in the proceeding dated 27.4.2011.

Concerned Section before preparing office report is expected and required to go through the previous proceedings carefully and then prepare office report.

Even today's office report is also unclear and vague. In these matters it is not clear as to how many respondents have been served and on behalf of how many respondents the undertaking has been made by the ld. Counsel about they filing vakalatnama. In view of the same it cannot be made out that why

-3-

Item No.16

process fee and spare copies are required to be paid to serve notice upon whom. Office is directed to prepare a clear office report conveying the clear meaning and giving full picture of the previous proceedings.

This observation would hold good in all the matters.

List again on 15.9.2011.

(H.B. PRABHAKARA SASTRY)
REGISTRAR

