

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).4741/2009

B.S.N.L.& ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

BHURI SINGH & ORS.

Respondent(s)

With SLP(C)No.11891,11892,27996,36384/2009 and 5501/2010

Date: 10/02/2011 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Prithvi Pal,Adv.
Mr Pavan Kumar,Adv.

Mr. Rajiv Tyagi,Adv.
Mr. Mithilesh Kumar,Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. M.K. Choudhary,Adv.
Mr. S.K. Verma,Adv.

Ms. Charu Mathur,Adv.

Mr. S. Gowthaman,Adv.

Mr. Alok Kumar,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

By order dated 9.2.2009 application for deleting the name of respondent no.3 in SLP(C)No.4741/2010 was allowed. Accordingly, the cause title of the SLP has been amended long back. In view of such fact observation in the office report dated 9.2.2011 regarding respondent No.3 in such SLP is not warranted. Registry has to explain in writing to the undersigned that how such fact is recorded in the office report without proper verification of the file. Registry has to explain why this improper statement has been made in the office report.

Ld. counsel for the petitioner in SLP(C)Nos.11891 and 11892/2009 pointed out that they have filed proof of service on 3.8.2010 and 5.8.2010.

..2/-

Item No.12 : 2 :

In SLP(C)No.36384/2009 fresh notice with dasti service is permitted as prayed for.

In SLP(C)No.5501/2010 it is seen that necessary disclosure was not made before the court when there was an order to issue notice. Now Ld. counsel for the petitioner seeks some time to complete service upon respondent Nos. 2 and 3. Ld. counsel for the petitioner is not aware about the unserved respondents. Registry has also not forward the file. In such situation, it is difficult to get the matter ready at the earliest. In any case, since petitioner has disclosed respondent Nos. 2 as proforma respondent, petitioner has to confirm service by dasti mode without fail before 10.3.2011.

Ld. counsel for the petitioner in SLP(C)No.5501/2010 is also complaining about non receipt of the copy of counter affidavit filed by respondent No.5. Registry has to explain how and why counter affidavit is accepted on record, if it is not served on either side.

List the matters on 10.3.2011.

S

(S.G. SHAH)
Registrar