

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

I.A.No.3 In

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).31233/2010

(From the judgment and order dated 12/05/2010 in PIL No.52/2007 of The HIGH COURT OF GUWAHATI, ASSAM)

RAHUL AGGARWAL

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF ARUNACHAL PRADESH &amp; ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for deletion of the name of respondent and office report)

Date: 21/08/2012 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MADAN B. LOKUR  
(IN CHAMBERS)

For Petitioner(s) Dr. (Mrs.) Vipin Gupta, Adv.(NP)

For Respondent(s) Mr. Anil Shrivastav, Adv.  
Mr. Rituraj Biswas, Adv.

Mr. Shreekant N. Terdal ,Adv

Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma ,Adv

Mr. Manish Goswami, Adv.  
For M/S Map & Co. ,Adv

Ms. Tanushree Sinha, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

## O R D E R

There is no appearance on behalf of the petitioner.

I.A.No.3 : This is an application for deleting the name of respondent nos. 14 to 21 from the array of parties.

Learned counsel appearing for respondent nos. 9 & 10 has pointed out that he has filed an application for dismissal of the special leave petition on the ground that there has been misrepresentation of facts by the petitioner. In this context, he has drawn my attention to order dated 18.3.2011 passed by this Court, whereby the petitioner was asked to explain the circumstances in which respondent nos. 14 to 21 have been added as parties in this special leave petition, even though they were apparently not parties in the writ petition before the High Court.

Learned counsel for respondent nos. 9 and 10 has further submitted that he would like to press this application for dismissal of the special leave petition on the basis of the order dated 18.3.2011 passed by this court as well as on other grounds.

It is brought to my notice that the application filed by the counsel for respondent nos. 9 & 10 for dismissal of the special leave petition is lying as defective.

Four weeks' time is granted to the counsel for respondent nos. 9 & 10 to cure the defects pointed out by the Registry.

After curing defects, list that application before the

Court.

In the meanwhile, without prejudice to the application filed by respondent nos. 9 and 10, I.A.No.3 is allowed and respondent nos. 14 to 21 are deleted from the memo of parties at the risk of the petitioner.

| (KUSUM SYAL)  
| SR.P.A  
|

| | (SHARDA KAPOOR)  
| | COURT MASTER  
| |

|