

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).31679/2010

BHULE RAM

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ANR

Respondent(s)

(With office report )

WITH

- SLP(C) NO. 1505 of 2011  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 158 of 2011  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 2092 of 2011  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 2093 of 2011  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 31848 of 2010  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 31903 of 2010  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 31904 of 2010  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 31961 of 2010  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 31978 of 2010  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 32021 of 2010  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 32027 of 2010  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 32042 of 2010  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 32071 of 2010  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 32080 of 2010  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 32081 of 2010  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 32086 of 2010  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 32108 of 2010  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 32250 of 2010  
(With office report)

Item No.15

- SLP(C) NO. 32348 of 2010  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 32613 of 2010  
(With office report)
- SLP(C) NO. 33316 of 2010

(With office report)  
SLP(C) NO. 33409 of 2010  
(With office report)  
SLP(C) NO. 34681 of 2010  
(With office report)  
SLP(C) NO. 34683 of 2010  
(With office report)  
SLP(C) NO. 34684 of 2010  
(With office report)  
SLP(C) NO. 3481 of 2011  
(With office report)  
SLP(C) NO. 4097 of 2011  
(With office report)  
SLP(C) NO. 4518 of 2011  
(With office report)  
SLP(C) NO. 4545 of 2011  
(With office report)  
SLP(C) NO. 4944 of 2011  
(With office report)  
SLP(C) NO. 4945 of 2011  
(With office report)

Date: 25/11/2011      This Petition was called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s)

Ms Bijoylashmi, adv.  
Ms. Shobha, Adv.  
Mr Shashindra Tripathi, Adv.  
Mr. Debasis Misra, Adv.  
Mr. Satpal Singh, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr Amrit Anand, Adv.  
Mr. Puneet Taneja, Adv.  
Mr Krutin R Joshi, Adv.  
Ms. Rachana Srivastava , Adv  
Mr. Ashwani Kumar, Adv.  
UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

The ld. Advocate for the petitioner says that they have paid process fee and spare copies thrice and since all the SLPs are from the same common impugned order, reply

-3-

Item No.15

filed by the respondent in some of the SLPs may be treated in SLPs where respondents are yet not served. This cannot be accepted as suggested. There must be proper proof of service upon each respondent in each SLP separately, even if the impugned order is same and even if facts and law point are common in all the SLPs. The fact remains that unless respondents are properly served, it would be difficult for this Court to direct the registry to list all the petitions

before the Hon'ble Court. Petitioners are permitted to take appropriate steps by selecting appropriate mode of service as provided under CPC to confirm service on unserved respondents.

Registry may inquire from the postal authority about the registered letter issued earlier. Further, the fact remains that it is the primary duty of the petitioner to see that notices are served on the respondent by appropriate mode. If proper steps are not taken, there is no option but to list before the Hon'ble Judge in Chambers for non-prosecution. The ld. Counsel for the petitioner can certainly serve advance copy of the pleadings; in view of their statement that reply filed by the concerned respondent in connected SLP can be treated as reply in this case; through Advocate who appears for such unserved respondent in any connected matter.

Petitioners are permitted to confirm service upon unserved respondent, if any, by dasti mode either through the Central Agency within the Supreme Court premises or

-4-

Item No.15

through the concerned Advocate who has filed appearance for such litigant in any of the connected SLP or through the standing counsel for the concerned litigant.

Now the ld. Advocate, Mr Krutin R Joshi appearing on behalf of Ms Rachna Srivastava, Advocate-on-record appearing for the unserved respondents in connected SLP says that they have received instructions to appear in all the SLPs for all such respondents and they want four weeks' time to file vakalatnama and counter affidavit. They may do so on or before the next date.

The ld. Advocate, Mr Amrit Anand appearing on behalf of Mr Puneet Taneja, Advocate-on-record; who is appearing for NTPC; states that they have filed appearance in all the

SLPs. Further, he accepts notice for such litigant in all SLPs , if it is not served, and seeks four weeks' time to file vakalatnama and counter affidavit. He may do so on or before the next date.

List again on 3.1.2012.  
(S.G. SHAH)  
REGISTRAR

hj