

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 B. SUDHEENDRA KUMAR

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).21184/2005

ARJUN D. CHIKALE & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

M/S. JAYSYNTH DYECHEM LTD. & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(With prayer for interim relief and office report )

WITH SLP(C) NO. 26220 of 2005

(With office report)

Date: 13/10/2006 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s) Ms. Shilpi Kaushik, Adv.

Mr. Vikas Mehta, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. B.S. Sai, Adv.

Mr. Nitin S. Tambwekar, Adv.

Mr. K. Rajeev, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

The records would show that A.D. card has been received back in respect of

respondent No.2 in SLP(C) No.21184/2005. The said respondent is common in SLP(C)

No.26220/2005 also. Therefore, notice can be treated as complete. That apart, the records

would show that notice to respondent No.2 in SLP(C) No.26220/2005 was sent on 10.1.2006 by

registered post A.D. However, neither the A.D. card nor the unserved envelope has been

received back so far from the above respondent. Therefore, I declare that there is deemed service of notice on the above respondent.

Service is complete on respondent No.2 in SLP(C) No.26220/2005 as provided under

proviso to sub-rule(5) of Rule 9 of Order V, C.P.C. and Section 27 of the General Clauses Act.

Item No.88

-2-

Respondent No.1 alone is having appearance in both the SLPs.

The records would show that respondent No.1 had sufficient time to file counter affidavit. However, by way of last opportunity, four weeks' time more is granted to

respondent No.1 to file counter affidavit.

Whether counter affidavit is filed or not, list the matters before the Hon'ble Court,

after the expiry of the aforesaid period of four weeks.

(B. Sudheendra Kumar)

Registrar

rd