

a1

ITEM NO.1

COURT NO.1 SECTION IVA
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 (C) No(s). 28181-28182/2009

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 02/07/2009

in RP No. 1016/2008 02/07/2009 in WA No. 6453/2002 passed by the
High Court Of Karnataka At Bangalore)

P.GURUNATH

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

ASSISTANT COMMR.& ORS.

Respondent(s)

(with appln. (s) for directions and interim relief and office
report)

Date : 28/10/2016 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE D.Y. CHANDRACHUD

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE L. NAGESWARA RAO

For Petitioner(s) Mr. V. Giri, Sr. Adv.

Mr. T. V. Ratnam, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. G.V. Chandrashekar, Adv.

Mr. N.K. Verma, Adv.

Ms. Anjana Chandrashekar, Adv.

Mr. Parikshit P. Angadi, Adv.

Mr. V. N. Raghupathy, Adv.

Mr. Anil V. Katarki, Adv.

Mr. Anil C. Nishan, Adv.

Ms. E. R. Sumathy, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Heard.

One of the legal heirs, left behind by original grantee,
arrayed as respondent no.8 in the special leave petitions has
passed away some time in the year 2003 i.e. even before the

2

High Court passed the order impugned in these special leave
petitions. No application for substitution of the legal
representatives of the deceased-respondent was ever made by the
petitioner herein before this Court or before the High Court.

It was only when the matter came up before this Court that the
afore-mentioned development was brought to light whereupon the
petitioner appears to have filed an application for

substitution of the legal representatives of the
deceased-respondent in the High Court. We are told by learned
counsel for the parties that apart from the deceased-respondent

no.8 there are as many as nine other respondents allegedly
representing the estate of the deceased-grantee. In that view,
the estate left behind by the grantee is sufficiently

represented, no matter the other alleged legal representatives
have also chosen not to contest the petitions. We therefore
see no reason to await the disposal of the application for

substitution filed by the petitioner before the High Court.

Mr. V. Giri, learned senior counsel appearing for the
petitioner, at this stage submits that respondent no.8-deceased
could as well be deleted from the array of the parties. We
order accordingly.

Post the matter for hearing at its turn.

(MAHABIR SINGH)

(VEENA KHERA)

COURT MASTER

COURT MASTER