

ITEM NO.14

COURT NO.3

SECTION IX

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)...../2010
CC 11686-11695/2010

(From the judgement and order dated 06/01/2009 in WP No.
2485/1994 & WP No. 2663/1994 & WP No. 2666/1994 & WP No.
2668/1994 & WP No. 2685/1994 & WP No. 2739/1994 & WP No.
2740/1994 & WP No. 2742/1994 & WP No. 2746/1994 & WP No.
2761/1994 of The HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY)

UNION OF INDIA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

CHAMPABAI DEVICHAND SAHA(D) BY LRS.& ORS

Respondent(s)

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

Date: 13/08/2010 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.V. RAVEENDRAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.L. GOKHALE

For Petitioner(s) Ms. Indira Jai Singh,ASG
Ms. Indira Sahwney,Adv.
Mr. Sachit Kumar Sahijpal,Adv.
Mr. Shreekant N. Terdal,Adv.

For Respondent(s)

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

There is a delay of 186 days in filing SLP
and delay of 250 days in refiling the SLP. The
delay is not satisfactorily explained. However, on
2

the facts and circumstances and in the interest of
justice, we consider it a fit case for condonation
of delay subject to petitioner's depositing
Rs.2500/- as costs with the Supreme Court Legal
Services Committee within four weeks from today and
producing acknowledgement.

Issue notice on the SLP to show cause why the matter should not be remanded to the High Court for deciding the matter with reference to Section 6 read with Section 3(c) of Smugglers & Foreign Exchange Manipulators (Forfeiture of Property) Act, 1976 by a reasoned order.

We find that SLP consists of four volumes, out of which two volumes are merely copies of seven judgments of this Court. The said two volumes run into more than 250 pages. If photocopies of the reported judgments had been filed, it would have hardly been 30-40 pages. apart from the fact that we would have had the benefit of head-notes. By filing the typed copies of this Court judgments without head-notes, no purpose is served except to add to the bulk of the file.

It is mentioned by the learned Additional Solicitor General for the petitioner that the Registry insists upon filing of typed copies (typed in double space) even in reported judgments of this Court and that is why, the petitioner has been forced to type and file them. Unless there is specific rule in that behalf, we do not find any reason why a party should be required to produce typed copies of the judgment of this Court when they are reported and the reports are easily available. The Registry to consider this aspect and take appropriate steps.

(O.P. Sharma)
Court Master

(M.S. Negi)
Court Master