

ITEM NO.81

REGISTRAR COURT. 1

SECTION XVII-A

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 SH. H. SHASHIDHARA SHETTY

Original Suit (s). No(s). 2/2011

THE STATE OF RAJASTHAN

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(O.S NO. 2 OF 2011 IS LISTED FOR EVIDENCE BEFORE THE LD. REGISTRAR SH. H. SHASHIDHARA SHETTY AT 2.30 P.M. in Registrar Court-1 (ORIGINAL SUIT NO. 1 OF 2011 WILL BE LISTED WITH O.S. NO. 2/2011 SEPARATELY, BUT IN SEQUENCE AS PER HON'BLE COURT'S ORDER DATED 9.03.2018 IN O.S NO. 1 OF 2011))

Date : 07-07-2023 This petition was called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s) Dr. Manish Singhvi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Atul Jha, Adv.
Ms. Awantika Manohar, Adv.
Ms. Shubhangi Agarwal, Adv.
Mr. Arpit Parkash, Adv.
Mr. D. K. Devesh, AOR

For Respondent(s) Mr. Jagjit Singh Chhabra, AOR
Mr. Vinay K. Shailendra, Adv.
Mr. Ajay Pal, Adv.

Mr. Wasim A. Quadri, Sr. Adv.
Mr. S Wasim Quadri, Adv.
Mr. Rajan Kumar Chourasia, Adv.
Mr. Siddhant Kohli, Adv.
Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, AOR

Mr. Aditya Sharma, AOR
Mr. Parth Kaushik, Adv.

Item No. 81

UPON hearing the counsel, the Court made the following
O R D E R

Today, the matter is fixed for further cross examination of PW1, Mr. Arun Kumar Gupta.

The learned counsel for the plaintiff and the defendant are present. The PW1 is further cross-examined by the learned counsel for the defendant No. 1 - State of Punjab.

The statement of PW1 stands recorded in question and answer format in the presence of learned counsel for both the parties from Question Nos. 78 to 96. With that, the learned counsel for the defendant No.1 has closed the cross-examination. The learned counsel for the defendant Nos. 2 and 3 submits that they do not want to cross-examine the PW1. With that the evidence of PW1 is closed.

The learned counsel for the plaintiff has closed the evidence on plaintiffs side.

Now, the learned counsel for the defendant No.1 in the Original Suit No. 2 of 2011 submits that the State of Haryana (defendant No. 4) is a proforma party and sailing with the plaintiff, so the evidence of defendant No. 4 should be recorded first and then the evidence of defendant No. 1 may be recorded.

Learned counsel for the plaintiff opposed it and submits that the evidence of defendants may be recorded in sequence and the affidavits of the parties have already been filed and no prejudice would be caused to the defendant No. 1.

Item No. 81

Heard.

Perused.

The defendant Nos. 1 to 4 have already filed affidavits and as per the Rules, the evidence of defendants should be recorded in sequence. Therefore, the prayer of the learned counsel for the defendant No. 1 is not heeded to and directed to lead the evidence on the next date of hearing for the evidence of defendant No.1.

As consented by the learned counsel for both the parties, the cross-examination of Mr. Jagmohan Singh Mann (DW1) is fixed on 28th and 29th August, 2023.

learned counsel for the defendant No. 1 is directed to keep the witness present on those dates at 2.30 pm.

H. SHASHIDHARA SHETTY
Registrar