

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).24106/2004

M/S. ENT NIRMATA SANGH & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With office report)

with

SLP(C) No.8965-8966/2005

(with office report)

Date: 05/07/2012 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Rachit Mittal, Adv.

Mr. Sudhir Kulshreshtha, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. S.A. Matto, Adv.

Mrs Anil Katiyar, Adv.

Mr. Prabal Bagchi, Adv.

Mr. D.N. Goburdhan, Adv

Ms. Nandini Gupta, Adv.

Ms. Hemantika Wahi, Adv

Ms. Naresh Bakshi, Adv

Mr. Suraj Singh, Adv.

Mr. Pradeep Misra, Adv

Mr. Prashant Bhushan, Adv

Mr. Vijay Panjwani, Adv

Mr. R. Ayyam Perumal, Adv

Mr. V.G. Pragasam, Adv

Mr. Yash Pal Dhingra, Adv

Mr. Ashok Kumar Singh, Adv

Ms. Kamakshi S. Mehlwal, Adv

Mr. Gautam Narayan, Adv.

Mr. Nikhil Nayyar, Adv

Mr. Manoj Kumar, Adv.

Mr. S. Chandra Shekhar, Adv

Item No.135

-2-

Mr. M.S. Panda, Adv.

Mr. Rutwik Panda, Adv

Mr. Snehasish Mukherjee, Adv

Mr. Navin Sharma, Adv.

Mr. B.S. Banthia, Adv.

Mr. Mukesh Verma, Adv.

Mr. Yashpal Dhingra, Adv.

Mr. V.D. Khanna, Adv.

Mr. K.B. Rohtagi, Adv.

Mr. T. Harish Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Manik Karanjawala, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

It is unfortunate that the Advocates appearing before this Court in many cases do not know that for which respondents they are appearing.

In the present case, notice upon the petitioner in SLP(C) No.8965-8966/2005 is to be served because their previous Advocate, Mr. Sudhir Nandrajog has been designated as Senior Advocate. At least to that effect, Registry has to be careful, since there is no proper disclosure in the office report.

Let there be a fresh notice for alternative arrangement upon petitioner in SLP(C) Nos.8965-8966/2005, before 23.8.2012, which is to be forwarded to the District and Sessions Court, Patiala for confirming service without fail, even by affixing the same at the given address, if it could not be served in due course.

Item No.135

-3-

However, the fact remains that the petitioner in such SLP being Punjab State Pollution Control Board is respondent No.17 in connected SLP No.24106/2004 and though it has been served in the SLP there is no separate disclosure regarding appearance of any Advocate nor vakalatnama. All such information was to be gathered from the original record only.

In view of the fact that we do not have proper and better Serving Agency including postal services which confirms the services properly in time.

List again on 23.8.2012.

(S.G. SHAH)  
REGISTRAR

rd