

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).26821/2009

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

K.SANKARAN

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for c/delay in filing SLP)

WITH SLP(C) NO. 26825 of 2009

(With office report)

SLP(C) NO. 26826 of 2009

(With office report)

SLP(C) NO. 26828 of 2009

(With office report)

SLP(C) NO. 9542 of 2009

(With orders)

Date: 30/09/2010 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s)

- Ms. Prachi Bajpai, Adv.
- Ms. Priyanka Mathur Sardana, Adv.
- Ms. Sushma Suri, Adv.
- Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

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

It is unfortunate that on every adjourned date, different Advocates are appearing on behalf of the concerned Advocate-on-Record for the concerned litigant and they are not aware about the status of the case.

Item No.37

-2-

For such reason, matters are being adjourned for months together on the same stage, more particularly for confirming the service and that too when some steps are to be taken by the litigant themselves.

In the present case, dasti service is allowed by the Hon'ble Court by an order dated 9.10.2009.

Petitioner is Union of India.

Dasti service is repeatedly required to be issued because of non-availability of proper postal services by the

Union of India.

Even after an order of dasti service, several respondents are unserved.

Repeatedly time was granted to disclose the outcome of dasti service.

On 25.8.2010 on request of the learned counsel for the petitioner though only two weeks' time was asked for, my predecessor has granted four weeks' time.

Now, today the learned Advocate, Ms. Prachi Bajpai and Ms. Priyanka Mathur Sardana appearing on behalf of Ms. Sushma Suri, Advocate-on-Record for the petitioner are present before the court and states that they have enquired from the Central Agency about the outcome of dasti service, in view of Item No.37

-3-

the earlier order and it is their statement that they have sent the notices to the concerned department being Southern Railway and they have not received any instruction or intimation regarding the proof of service and therefore, they are unable to file proof of service on record.

It is unfortunate that though unserved respondent is serving under railway and though dasti service is allowed on 9.10.2009, petitioner is not able to confirm the service upon the unserved respondents.

In view of the above facts, list the matter before the Hon'ble Judge in Chambers for non-prosecution.

(S.G. SHAH)
REGISTRAR

rd