

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

I.A.NOs. 8-31  
in  
CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 98-112 OF 2005

CHANDGI & ORS. Appellant (s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ANR. Respondent(s)

O R D E R

I.A.Nos. 8, 9 & 10 in C.A. No. 99 of 2005

There is an inordinate delay of 1341 days in filing the application for substitution of L.Rs. of deceased appellant No.4 (Samandar Singh).

No cause, much less sufficient cause, has been shown for condoning this huge delay.

Accordingly, the application for condonation of delay in filing application for substitution is rejected.

Consequently, the substitution application, being barred by limitation, stands dismissed.

I.A.NOs. 11, 12 & 13 in C.A. No. 101 of 2005

There is a delay of 215 days in filing the application for substitution of L.Rs. of appellant No.3 (Surjit Singh).

Delay in filing the substitution application is condoned, and the substitution application is allowed.

Amended cause title be filed within two weeks.

I.A.NOs. 14, 15 & 16 in C.A. No. 101 of 2005

There is an inordinate delay of 1334 days in filing the application for substitution of L.Rs. of appellant No.1 (Iswar Singh).

No cause, much less sufficient cause, has been shown for condoning this huge delay.

Accordingly, the application for condonation of delay in filing application for substitution is rejected.

Consequently, the substitution application, being barred by limitation, stands dismissed.

I.A.Nos. 17 to 22 in C.A.Nos. 99 & 104 of 2005

There is an inordinate delay of 1854 days in filing the application for substitution of L.Rs. of common appellant No.2 in Civil Appeal No. 99/2005 and appellant No. 1 in Civil Appeal No. 104 of 2005 (Mahender Singh).

No cause, much less sufficient cause, has been shown for condoning this huge delay.

Accordingly, the applications for condonation of delay in filing applications for substitution is rejected.

Consequently, the substitution applications, being barred by limitation, stand dismissed.

I.A.Nos.23 to 28 in C.A. No. 109 of 2005

There is an inordinate delay of 579 days in filing the application for substitution of L.Rs. of appellant No.1 (Tek Ram).

No cause, much less sufficient cause, has been shown for condoning this huge delay.

Accordingly, the application for condonation of delay in filing application for substitution is rejected.

Consequently, the substitution application, being barred by limitation, stands dismissed.

I.A.Nos. 29 to 31 in C.A. No. 112 of 2005

There is a delay of 347 days in filing the application for

substitution of L.Rs. of sole appellant (Leela Singh).

Delay in filing the substitution application is condoned, and the substitution application is allowed.

Amended cause title be filed within two weeks.

.....J  
(CHANDRAMAULI KR. PRASAD)

NEW DELHI,  
JULY 16, 2012

ITEM NO.6

COURT NO.8

SECTION IV

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

I.A.NOs. 8-31 in CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 98-112 OF 2005

CHANDGI & ORS.

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for substitution, exemption from filing O.T.,  
c/delay in filing substitution appln. and office report)

Date: 16/07/2012 These I.As. were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRAMAULI KR. PRASAD  
(IN CHAMBERS)

For Appellant(s) Mr. S.K. Dubey, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Naveen Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Shawah Bhusan, Adv.

Mr. Yogesh Tiwari, Adv.

Mr. Arun Kumar Beriwal, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Manjit Singh, Addl.A.G.

Ms. Vivekta Singh, Adv.

Mr. Tarjit Singh, Adv.

Mr. Kamal Mohan Gupta, Adv.

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

The I.As. are disposed of in terms of the signed order.

| (G. SUDHAKARA RAO)  
| COURT MASTER

| | (SHARDA KAPOOR)  
| | COURT MASTER

(SIGNED ORDER IS PLACED ON THE FILE)