

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).28501/2009

(From the judgement and order dated 06/02/2009 in CRA No. 74/2005  
of The HIGH COURT OF J & K AT JAMMU)

SANTOSH SHARMA & ORS. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

MATA VAISHNO DEVI SHRINE BOARD Respondent(s)

WITH SLP(C) NO. 28502 of 2009  
(With office report)

AND SLP (C)No. 26567 of 2010  
(With office report)

Date: 04/10/2010 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MARKANDEY KATJU  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE T.S. THAKUR

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. A. Sharan, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Amit Anand Tiwari, Adv.  
Mr. Vikram Sharma, Adv.  
Ms. Binu Tamta, Adv.

SLP(C)No.26567/2010 Mr. Subhash Sharma, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Ashok Mathur, Adv.

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

Mr. Jugal Kishor, petitioner No. 2, is present in person.

Mr. A. Sharan, Learned Counsel for the petitioners, states  
that the petitioners were let into possession of Shop No. 3 by the  
erstwhile Dharmarth Trust who was handling the affairs of shrine of

Mata Vaishno Devi. They further state that ever since 1965 none of  
the petitioners or their predecessor-in-interest had ev  
er

participated in or executed any document except in the nature of

lease deed or a license deed and that they continued paying what was

described as rent to Dharmarth Trust which was not more th  
an

Rs.26000 per annum. Mr. Sharan submits that the four documents

were purported to have been signed and executed by Sobha Ram and

Petitioner No. 2 in the year 1994 which documents have be  
en

challenged by the petitioners in separate suits, pending before the Trial Court. Mr. Sharan and Mr. Jugal Kishor, petitioner No. 2

agreed to file an affidavit stating the above facts on behalf of all

the petitioners including Petitioner No. 2 to support the

assertions. He shall do so within one week with a copy to Mr. Ashok

Mathur, Counsel opposite, who shall have two weeks thereafter to

file a reply supported by whatever documents are relevant to the

controversy.

Mr. Sharan, Counsel for the petitioners, says that the

orders passed by this Court in these Special Leave Petitions may be

passed in SLP (C)No. 26567/2010 also, as the facts are identical.

Counsel agrees to file affidavit in that petition as well stating

the relevant facts indicated above.

Issue notice in SLP (C)No.26567/2010.

Mr. Ashok Mathur,

Counsel for the respondent, accepts notice.

Affidavit by Mr. Sharma, Counsel for the petitioner in SLP

(C)No.26567/2010, as indicated above, be filed within one week.

Counter Affidavit by Mr. Mathur within one week thereafter.

Rejoinder within one week thereafter.

Post the Special Leave Petitions together thereafter.

(Nidhi Chugh) (Indu Satiya)  
Sr. P. A. Court Master