

i»¿SECTION-III
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION (C) NOS. 1844 OF 2011, 904 of 2013, 1848 of 2010, 644 & 1681 OF
2011
IN
PETITION FOR SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION NOS. 21507, 19481, 19498, 19502 & and 19492 OF
2010 RESPECTIVELY

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

...PETITIONERS

-VERSUS-

M/S MUNDRA PORT & SPL ECONOMIC ZONE
LTD. & ORS. ETC.

...RESPONDENTS

OFFICE REPORT

The office report was listed before the Ld. Registrar Court on 25th September
2013, when the following order was passed :

â€œRP(C) NO.1844/2011

Three weeks' time is granted as final chance to respondent No.1 for filing
counter affidavit.

Respondent Nos. 2 to 4 have been ordered to proceed ex parte vide order
dt.27.8.2013.

RP(C) NO.904/2013

On filing of process fee and spare copies within two weeks, notice be re
issued to the sole respondent through the concerned District Court in addition to
postal service.

RP(C) NO.1848/2010 IN SLP(C) NO.19498/2010

The ld. Counsel for the petitioner, Ms Swati has undertaken to carry out the
necessary amendment in the cause title in respect of the name of respondent No.1-
Company which was permitted vide order of the Hon'ble Judge in Chambers
dt.19.8.2013.

Respondent No.1 is granted three weeks' time as final chance for filing
counter affidavit.

Respondent no.2 is reported to be duly served but none appeared on his
behalf.

RP(C) NO.644/2011 IN SLP(C) NO.19502/2010

It appears that the ld. Counsel for the petitioner has already carried out
the amendment in the cause title in respect of

-2-

the change in the name of the respondent-company. Registry to submit complete
report

about the status of the respondent as to whether he is properly represented or not.
RP(C) NO.1681/2011 IN SLP(C) NO.19492/2010

Right of respondent No.1 to file counter affidavit has been already exhausted
vide order dt.27.8.2013.

Necessary amendment in the cause title with respect to the change of the name

of the respondent-company has been carried out as reflected from the office report.
However, further necessary orders would be passed as and when other connected matters would become ready.

List again on 11.11.2013.â€

REVIEW PETITION NO. 1844 OF 2010

It is submitted that Mr. Praveen Kumar, Advocate has filed Vakalatnama/Appearance on behalf of the all respondents but has not filed counter affidavit on behalf of respondent no.1 so far as directed.

REVIEW PETITION NO. 904 OF 2011

It is submitted that counsel for the petitioner has neither filed process fee nor furnished the fresh & complete address of the sole respondent so far. Hence, notice could not be issued to sole respondent through the concerned District Court in addition to postal service.

REVIEW PETITION NOS. 1848/2010

It is submitted that counsel for respondent no.1 has already filed counter affidavit. Notice has been served on respondent No.2 but no one has filed Vakalatnama/Appearance so far. Service of notice is complete.

REVIEW PETITION NO. 644/2011 in SLP No. 19502 of 2010

It is submitted that the sole respondent is represented through Mr. E.C Agrawala, Advocate but has not filed counter affidavit so far. Service of notice is complete.

-3-

REVIEW PETITION NO. 1681/2011 in SLP NO. 19492 of 2010

It is submitted that respondent no.1 is represented through Mr. E.C Agrawala, Advocate but has not filed counter affidavit so far. No one has filed Vakalatnama/Appearance on behalf of respondent no.2 though served with a notice.

The Office report is listed before the Ld. Registrar Court with this office report.

Dated this the 9th day of November, 2013.

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

Copy to:

1.Mr. B.K. Prasad, Advocate,
Central Agency Section

2.Mr. E.C Agrawala, Advocates,
48, Lawyers Chamber

3.Mr. Praveen kumar, Advocate
230, New Lawyers Chamber

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR