

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 TRANSFER PETITION (CIVIL.) NO(s). 6 OF 2009

BHUSHAN KUMAR MEEN Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

HARPREET KAUR @ MANSI MEEN Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for directions and office report)

Date: 12/11/2010 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.M. PANCHAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.L. GOKHALE

For Petitioner(s) Petitioner-In-Person (N.P.)

For Respondent(s) Respondent-In-Person

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E RInterlocutory Application is dismissed in  
terms of the signed order.(Neetu Sachdeva)  
Sr. P. A.(Sneh Lata Sharma)  
Court Master(signed order is placed on the file)  
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

I.A. NO. 3

IN

TRANSFER PETITION (CIVIL.) NO(s). 6 OF 2009

BHUSHAN KUMAR MEEN Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

HARPREET KAUR @ MANSI MEEN Respondent(s)

O R D E R

Mr. Bhushan Kumar Meen had filed Transfer Petition No.6/2009, praying to transfer the case from Patiala to Delhi. However, the said Transfer Petition was dismissed by an order dated 14.12.2009.

In the disposed of matter, the petitioner has again filed I. A. No.3 of 2010 wherein prayer is made to issue directions to the trial court for granting equal opportunity to both the parties to lead evidence. When the matter is called out, the petitioner, who appears in person has not remained present whereas the respondent who also appears in person is present. The order dated 29.4.2010 shows that efforts were made by the learned Judge for reconciliation between the parties and the matter was adjourned to 15.5.2010. Again, on 15.5.2010, the petitioner did not remain present, and therefore, the case was required to be adjourned to 31.5.2010. On

- 2 -

31.5.2010, the petitioner filed an application to bring subsequent events on record and, therefore, the matter was adjourned to 12.6.2010. The record further shows that on 12.6.2010, the case was adjourned to 31.7.2010 for evidence of the respondent herein. The record does not indicate that the learned Judge is going on recording the evidence of respondent only and no opportunity is given to the petitioner. Hence, the application has no substance. It fails and is dismissed.

The respondent has made a grievance that because of non-cooperation of the petitioner, the Court has not been able to dispose of the case within the time stipulated by this court and prays that appropriate direction be given to the concerned court to dispose of the case within the time to be stipulated by this Court.

Having regard to the facts of the case, the concerned Court is requested to dispose of the case as early as possible and preferably within six months from the date of the receipt of writ of this Court.

.....J.  
(J. M. PANCHAL)

NEW DELHI  
NOVEMBER 12, 2010

.....J.  
(H. L. GOKHALE)