

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 S.G. SHAH

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).2148/2006

CHANDER SINGH@MOHAN SINGH(D)TH.LRS.&ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

HARI SINGH (D) TH.LRS. & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With prayer for interim relief and office report)

WITH SLP(C) NO. 2959 of 2006

(With prayer for interim relief and office report)

SLP(C) NO. 2960 of 2006

(With prayer for interim relief and office report)

SLP(C) NO. 4142 of 2006

(With prayer for interim relief and office report)

SLP(C) NO. 4143 of 2006

(With prayer for interim relief and office report)

SLP(C) NO. 4327 of 2006

(With prayer for interim relief and office report)

SLP(C) NO. 4383 of 2006

(With prayer for interim relief and office report)

Date: 18/04/2007 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. S.K. Sinha,Adv.

Mr. Annam D.N. Rao, Adv.

Ms. Neelam Jain, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Ms. Pratibha Jain, Adv.

Gp.Capt.Karan Singh Bhati ,Adv.

Ms. Aishwaarya Bhati, Adv.

Mr. Krishna Mohan Jha, Adv.

Ms. Sweta, Adv.

Ms. Suchitra A. Chitale, Adv.

Mr. Dhruv Madan, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

It is pointed out that Respondent No.2 (a) to (h) could not be served in SLP(C) No. 2959 and 2960/2006. Notice to them were issued initially on May, 2006 and thereafter in September, 2006, nothing is received back from these respondents.

It is also pointed out that these respondents are petitioner in SLP(C) No. 2148/2006.

Learned Advocate for such litigants have petitioners in SLP(C) No. 2148/2006 is requested for appearance on behalf of such respondents

- 2 -

-

to whom office could not served in due course since they are petitioner and they are before this Court. It is requested by the learned Advocate for the petitioner in SLP (C) No. 2148/2006 to file appearance for such litigants whom they represented and who could not be served in connected SLPs.

It is his say that he would file appearance for such respondents in other SLPs and absence of instructions by the client.

It is certain that unserved respondents in SLP(C) Nos. 2959 and 2960/2006 are petitioner in SLP(C) No. 2148/2006 and office could not be served them either by Regd. Post or by Courier in other SLPs.

In view of the above fact matter be listed before the Hon'ble Chamber Judge for appropriate directions whether notices in SLP(C) Nos. 2959 and 2960/2006 could be served to the petitioner through their advocate in SLP(C) No. 2148/2006 or not.

(S.G. Shah)
Registrar

MG