

SECTION IV B

Listed on. 10.10.2014

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA Court No. 6

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION Item No. 28

PETITIONS FOR SPECIAL LEAVE TO APPEAL(CIVIL) NOS. SLP(C) 11684 OF 2012, CC NOS. 14663 of 2010, 20144 of 2010, 9303 of 2011, 15876 of 2011, 16190 of 2011, 16303 of 2011, 16309 of 2011, 16325 of 2011, 16326 of 2011, 16327 of 2011, 16350 of 2011, 16548 of 2011, 16580 of 2011, 16582 of 2011, 16594 of 2011, 16723 of 2011, 16850 of 2011, 16904 of 2011, 17192 of 2011, 17193 of 2011, 17201 of 2011, 17204 of 2011, 17388 of 2011, 17507 of 2011, 17508 of 2011, 17534 of 2011, 17709 of 2011, 17711 of 2011, 17735 of 2011, 17798 of 2011, 17835 of 2011, 17846 of 2011, 17888 of 2011, 18227 of 2011, 18261 of 2011, 18286 of 2011, 18310 of 2011, 18312 of 2011, 18337 of 2011, 18423 of 2011, 18524 of 2011, 18525 of 2011, 18526 of 2011, 18527 of 2011, 18535 of 2011, 18536 of 2011, 18628 of 2011, 18630 of 2011, 18767 of 2011, 18769 of 2011, 18784 of 2011, 18796 of 2011, 18802 of 2011, 18805 of 2011, 18834 of 2011, 18857 of 2011, 18960 of 2011, 19116 of 2011, 19236 of 2011, 19527 of 2011, 19552 of 2011, 19556 of 2011, 19580 of 2011, 19590 of 2011, 19594 of 2011, 19597 of 2011, 19599 of 2011, 19601 of 2011, 19663 of 2011, 19727 of 2011, 19837 of 2011, 19864 of 2011, 20022 of 2011, 20024 of 2011, 20048 of 2011, 20291 of 2011, 20454 of 2011, 20794 of 2011, 20891 of 2011, 21915 of 2011, 22255 of 2011, 22256 of 2011, 22257 of 2011, SLP 30473 of 2011,, SLP 33651 of 2011, SLP 35876 of 2011, CC Nos. 133 of 2012, 178 of 2012, 434 of 2012, 887 of 2012, 1147 of 2012, 1166 of 2012, 1168 of 2012, 1188 of 2012, 1200 of 2012, 1291 of 2012, 1303 of 2012, 1306 of 2012, 1391 of 2012, 1596 of 2012, 1637 of 2012, 1644 of 2012, 1653 of 2012, 1657 of 2012, 1739 of 2012, 1864 of 2012, 1869 of 2012, 1928 of 2012, 1935 of 2012, 2209 of 2012, 2798 of 2012, 2818 of 2012, 2821 of 2012, 2832 of 2012, SC 4822 of 2012, CC Nos. 6093 of 2012, 6483 of 2012, 6604 of 2012, CC 6632-6633 of 2012, 6659 of 2012, SC 6692 of 2012, CC Nos. 6800 of 2012, CC 6829 of 2012, CC 10109 of 2012, SC NOS. 11690 of 2012, 11693 of 2012, 11694 of 2012, 11697 of 2012, 11699 of 2012, 11702 of 2012, 11703 of 2012, 11704 of 2012, 11705 of 2012, 11706 of 2012, 11707 of 2012, 11709 of 2012, 11710 of 2012, 11712 of 2012, CC Nos. 12769 of 2012, 13044 of 2012, 13114 of 2012, CC 13300 of 2012, SC Nos. 26306 of 2012, 26307 of 2012, 26308 of 2012, 26386 of 2012, 26388 of 2012, 26389 of 2012, 26391 of 2012, 28655 of 2012, 28812 of 2012, 28813 of 2012, 28814 of 2012, 28815 of 2012, 28816 of 2012, 28817 of 2012, 28818 of 2012, 28819 of 2012, 28823 of 2012, 28824 of 2012, 28825 of 2012, 28827 of 2012, 28828 of 2012, 28829 of 2012, 30246 of 2012, 30751 of 2012, 33343 of 2012, 33345 of 2012, 33347 of 2012, 33348 of 2012, 33350 of 2012, 33352 of 2012, 33353 of 2012, 33354 of 2012, 33356 of 2012, 35328 of 2012, 37149 of 2012, 37151 of 2012, 37152 of 2012, 37153 of 2012, 37154 of 2012, 39202 of 2012, SC Nos. 519 of 2013, 523 of 2013, 524 of 2013, CC 2335 of 2013,

SC Nos. 5751 of 2013, 5753 of 2013, 5765 of 2013, 5810 of 2013, 5821 of 2013, 5838 of 2013, CC 6861 of 2013, SC 9907 of 2013, 9909 of 2013, 9911 of 2013 9912 of 2013, 9913 of 2013, 9914 of 2013, 9915 of 2013, 9916 of 2013, 9918 of 2013, 10927 of 2013, 10928 of 2013, 10929 of 2013, 10930 of 2013, 10931 of 2013, 10933 of 2013, 10934 of 2013, 190935 of 2013, 10936 of 2013, 10938 of 2013, 10939 of 2013, 10940 of 2013, 10941 of 2013, 10942 of 2013, 10943 of 2013, 11068 of 2013, 11069 of 2013, 11072 of 2013, 13021 of 2013, 13023 of 2013, 14780 of 2013, 14782 of 2013, 15299 of 2013, 15300 of 2013, 15301 of 2013, 15302 of 2013, 15303 of 2013, 15305 of 2013, 15307 of 2013, 15852 of 2013, 16788 of 2013, 17618 of 2013, 18880 of 2013, 19469 of 2013, 20529 of 2013, 20830 of 2013, 21492 of 2013, 21554 of 2013, CC 3626 of 2014, SC 8086 of 2014, 8103 of 2014.

AND
WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF

AND
INTERLOCUTORY APPLICATION NOS.1-2
(Applications for condonation of delay in filing and refiling the Special Leave Petitions)

State of Punjab & Ors. ...Petitioner(s)

Versus

Rajiq Masih (White Washer) & Etc. ...Respondent(s)

OFFICE REPORT

The matters above mentioned were listed before the Hon'ble Court on 08.07.2014 with the office report order dated 07.07.2014 when the Court was pleased to pass the following order :-

"1.These batch of matters are placed before Mr. Umang Shankar, Advocate. for authoritative pronouncement on the apparent difference of opinion expressed on one hand in the cases of Shyam Babu Verma and Ors. v. Union of India & Ors. (1994) 2 SCC 521 and Sahib Ram Verma v. State of Haryana (1995) Supp. 1 SCC 18 and on the other hand, in Chandi Prasad Uniyal and Ors. v. State of Uttarakhand & Ors. (2012) 8 SCC 417. The order of reference made by this Court reads as under :

"In View of an apparent difference of views expressed on the one hand in Shyam Babu Verma and Ors. vs. Union of India & Ors. (1994) 2 SCC 521 and Sahib Ram Verma vs. State of Haryana (1995)

Supp. 1 SCC 18; and on the other hand in Chandi Prasad Uniyal and Ors. vs. State of Uttarakhand & Ors. (2012) 8 SCC 417, we are of the view that the remaining special leave petitions should be placed before a Bench of Three Judges. The Registry is accordingly directed to place the file of the remaining special leave petitions before the Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India for taking instructions for the constitution of a Bench of Three Judges, to adjudicate upon the present controversy."

2. The issue in this matter pertains to the recovery of excess money from the pensionary benefit of the respondent-white washer, on account of a wrong fixation of pay by the Petitioner No. 4-The Executive Engineer. The respondent approached the High Court by filing a writ petition. The question of law for consideration before the High Court was: whether the Government is entitled to recover from an employee any payment made in excess of what the employee is otherwise entitled to, in the absence of any fraud or misrepresentation on the part of the employee. The High Court relies on a Full Bench decision, and directed not to recover the excess amount from the respondent.

3. We have heard Shri L. N. Rao, learned Additional Solicitor General and the learned counsel for the respondents.

4. To answer the reference, the decisions need to be considered.

5. In Shyam Babu Verma's case (Supra), this Court while observing that the petitioners-therein were not entitled to the higher pay scales, had come to the conclusion that since the amount has already been paid to the petitioner, for no fault of theirs, the said amount shall not be recovered by the respondent-Union of India. The observations made by this Court in the said case are as under:

"Although we have held that the petitioners were entitled only to the pay scale of Rs.330-480 in terms of the recommendations of the Third Pay Commission w.e.f.

January 1, 1973 and only after the period of 10 years, they became entitled to the pay scale of Rs.330-560 but as they have received the scale of Rs.330-560 since 1973 due to no fault of theirs and that scale is being reduced in the year 1984 with effect from January 1, 1973, it shall only be just and proper not to recover any excess amount which has already been paid to them. (emphasis supplied)."

6. In Sahib Ram Verma's case (Supra), this Court once againv held that although the appellant-therein did not possess the required educational qualification, yet the Principal granting him the relaxation, had paid his salary on the revised pay scale. This Court further observed that this was not on account of mis-representation made by the appellant but by a mistake committed by the Principal. In a fact situation of that nature, the Court was pleased to observe that the amount already paid to the appellant need not be recovered. In the words of the Court:

"Admittedly the appellant does not possess the required educational qualifications. Under the circumstances the appellant would not be entitled to the relaxation. The principal erred in granting him the relaxation. Since the date of relaxation the appellant had been paid his salary on the revised scale. However, it is not on account of any misrepresentation made by the appellant that the benefit of the higher pay scale was given to him but by wrong construction made by the Principal for which appellant cannot be held to be fault. Under the circumstances the amount paid till date may not be recovered from the appellant."

7. In our considered view, the observations made by the Court not to recover the excess amount paid to the appellant-therein were in exercise of its extra-ordinary powers under Article 142 of the Constitution of India which vest the power in this Court to pass equitable orders in the ends of justice.

8. In Chandi Prasad Uniyal's case (Supra), a specific issue was raised and canvassed. The issue was whether the appellant-therein can retain the amount received on the basis of irregular/wrong pay fixation in the absence of any misrepresentation or fraud on his part. The Court after taking into consideration the various decisions of this Court had come to the conclusion that even if by mistake of the employer the amount is paid to the employee and on a later date if the employer after proper determination of the same discovers that the excess payment is made by mistake or negligence, the excess payment so made could be recovered. While holding so this Court observed at paragraphs 14 and 16 as under:

"14. We are concerned with the excess payment of public money which is often described as "taxpayers' money" which belongs neither to the officers who have effected overpayment nor to the recipients. We fail to see why the concept of fraud or misrepresentation is being brought in such situations. The question to be asked is whether excess money has been paid or not, may be due to a bona fide mistake. Possibly, effecting excess payment of public money by the government officers may be due to various reasons like negligence, carelessness, collusion, favouritism, etc. because money in such situation does not belong to the payer or the payee. Situations may also arise where both the payer and the payee are at fault, then the mistake is mutual. Payments are being effected in many situations without any authority of law and payments have been received by the recipients also without any authority of law. Any amount paid/received without the authority of law can always be recovered barring few exceptions of extreme hardships but not as a matter of right, in such situations law implies an obligation on the payee to repay the money, otherwise it would amount to unjust enrichment.

16. The appellant in the appeal will not fall in any of these exceptional categories, over and above, there was a

stipulation in the fixation order that in the condition of irregular/wrong pay fixation, the institution in which the appellants were working would be responsible for recovery of the amount received in excess from the salary/pension. In such circumstances, we find no reason to interfere with the judgment of the High Court. However we order that excess payment made be recovered from the appellants salary in 12 equal monthly instalments."

9. In our view, the law laid down in Chandi Prasad Uniyal's case, no way conflicts with the observations made by this Court in the other two cases. In those decisions, directions were issued in exercise of the powers of this Court under Article 142 of the Constitution, but in the subsequent decision this Court under Article 136 of the Constitution, in laying down the law had dismissed the petition of the employee. This Court in a number of cases had battled with tracing the contours of the provision in Article 136 and 142 of the Constitution of India. Distinctively, although the words employed under the two aforesaid provision speak of the powers of this Court, the former vest a plenary jurisdiction in supreme court in the matter of entertaining and hearing of appeals by granting special leave against any judgment or order made by a Court or Tribunal in any cause or matter. The powers are plenary to the extent that they are paramount to the limitations under the specific provisions for appeal contained in the Constitution or other laws. Article 142 of the Constitution of India, on the other hand is a step ahead of the powers envisaged under Article 136 of the Constitution of India. It is the exercise of jurisdiction to pass such enforceable decree or order as is necessary for doing 'complete justice' in any cause or matter. The word 'complete justice' was fraught with uncertainty until Article 142 of the Constitution received its first interpretation in Prem Chand Garg v. Excise Commissioner, U.P., AIR (1963) SC 996 which added a rider to the exercise of wide extraordinary powers by laying down that though the powers are wide, the same is an ancillary power and can be used when not expressly in conflict with the substantive provisions of law. This view was endorsed by a

Nine-Judges Bench in *Naresh Shridhar Mirajkar v. State of Maharashtra*, (1966) 3 SCR 744 reiterated by a Seven Judge Bench in *A.R. Antulay v. R.S. Nayak*, (1988) 2 SCC 602 and finally settled in the *Supreme Court Bar Association v. Union of India*, (1998) 4 SCC 409.

10. Article 136 of the Constitution of India, confers a wide discretionary power on the Supreme Court to interfere in suitable cases. Article 136 is a special jurisdiction and can be best described in the words of this Court in *Ramakant Rai v. Madab Rai*, (2003) 12 SCC 395, "It is a residuary power, it is extraordinary in its amplitude, its limits when it chases injustice, is the sky itself". Article 136 of the Constitution of India was legislatively intended to be exercised by the Highest Court of the Land, with scrupulous adherence to the settled judicial principle well established by precedents in our jurisprudence. Article 136 of the Constitution is a corrective jurisdiction that vest a discretion in the Supreme Court to settle the law clear and as forthrightly forwarded in the case of *Union of India v. Karnail Singh*, (1995) 2 SCC 728, it makes the law operational to make it a binding precedent for the future instead of keeping it vague. In short, it declares the law, as under Article 141 of the Constitution.

11. Article 142 of the Constitution of India is supplementary in nature and cannot supplant the substantive provisions, though they are not limited by the substantive provisions in the statute. It is a power that gives preference to equity over law. It is a justice oriented approach as against the strict rigors of the law. The directions issued by the court can normally be categorized into one, in the nature of moulding of relief and the other, as the declaration of law. 'Declaration of Law' as contemplated in Article 141 of the Constitution: is the speech express or necessarily implied by the Highest Court of the land. This Court in the case of *Indian Bank v. ABS Marine Products (P) Ltd.*, 2006 5 SCC 72, *Ram Pravesh Singh v. State of Bihar*, (2006) 8 SCC 381 and in *State of U.P. v. Neeraj Awasthi* (2006) 1 SCC 667, has expounded the principle and extolled the power of Article 142 of the Constitution of India to new heights by laying

down that the directions issued under Article 142 do not constitute a binding precedent unlike Article 141 of the Constitution of India. They are direction issued to do proper justice and exercise of such power, cannot be considered as law laid down by the Supreme Court under Article 141 of the Constitution of India. The Court have compartmentalized and differentiated the relief in the operative portion of the judgment by exercise of powers under Article 142 of the Constitution as against the law declared. The directions of the Court under Article 142 of the Constitution, while moulding the relief, that relax the application of law or exempt the case in hand from the rigour of the law in view of the peculiar facts and circumstances do not comprise the ratio decidendi and therefore lose its basic premise of making it a binding precedent. This Court on the qui vive has expanded the horizons of Article 142 of the Constitution by keeping it outside the purview of Article 141 of the Constitution and by declaring it a direction of the Court that changes its complexion with the peculiarity in the facts and circumstances of the case.

12. Therefore, in our opinion, the decisions of the Court based on different scales of Article 136 and Article 142 of the Constitution of India cannot be best weighed on the same grounds of reasoning and thus in view of the aforesaid discussion, there is no conflict in the views expressed in the firsttwo judgments and the latter judgment.

13. In that view of the above, we are of the considered opinion that reference was unnecessary. Therefore, without answering the reference, we send back the matters to the Division Bench for its appropriate disposal.

Ordered accordingly."

Latest Service position of each matter is as follows:-

SLP No.	Total Respondents	Through Advocate	Through A.D./Dastis	Neither A.D nor unserved cover	Remarks
11684/12	1	1	-	-	Complete
11697/12	5	-	-	-	Incomplete
11702/12	1	-	-	-	Incomplete
11690/12	1	1	-	-	Complete no C/A
11705/12	1	-	-	-	Incomplete
11706/12	1	1	-	-	Complete C/A
11709/12	1	-	1	-	Complete
11712/12	1	1	-	-	Complete No C/A
11707/12	1	1	-	-	Complete N. C/A
11710/12	1	1	-	-	Incomplete
11704/12	1	-	1	-	Complete N. C/A
11699/12	1	-	-	-	Complete no C/A
11693/12	1	-	-	-	Incomplete
11694/12	1	-	-	-	Complete
11703/12	1	-	1	-	Complete
35328/12	1	-	1	-	Complete
37153/12	1	-	1	-	Complete
37152/12	1	1	-	-	Complete
37154/12	2	-	2	-	Complete
37151/12	1	-	1	-	Complete

37149/12	1	-	1	-	Complete
39202/12	1	-	-	-	Incomplete
13021/13	Sole	-	-	-	Incomplete
13023/13	Sole	-	-	-	Incomplete
14780/13	3	-	1 & 2	-	Incomplete
14782/13	Sole	-	-	-	Incomplete
15852/13	Sole	-	Sole Respondent has sent an affidavit but has not filed memo of appearance so far.	-	However service is complete
15299/13	Sole	1	-	-	Incomplete
15300/13	Sole	-	1	-	Incomplete
15301/13	Sole	1	-	-	Incomplete
15302/13	Sole	1	-	-	Incomplete
15303/13	Sole	Mr. Vineet Bhagat, Advocate	-	-	Complete (C/A not filed)

15305/13	Sole	-	-	-	Incomplete
15307/13	5	-	2,3	-	Incomplete
16788/13	2	-	-	Both	Incomplete
18880/13	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
19469/13	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
17618/13	1	1	-	-	Complete
26306/12	3	-	1-3	-	Complete
26307/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
28813/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
28814/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
28815/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
28816/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
28817/12	1	1	-	-	Complete
28818/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
28819/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
28825/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
28827/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete

28655/12	20	-	-	1-20	Incomplete
28823/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
28824/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
28829/12	1	1	-	-	Complete
28828/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
30751/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
28812/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
26391/12	1	Sole	-	-	Complete
26388/12	1	-	-	1-5	Incomplete
26389/12	1	1	-	-	Complete
26386/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
33343/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
30246/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
33347/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
33348/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
33350/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
33352/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
33353/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete

26308/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
21554/13	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
33356/12	4	-	-	1 to 4	Incomplete
33354/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
33345/12	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
20529/13	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
20830/13	1	-	-	1	Incomplete
10927/13	Sole	-	-	Sole	Incomplete
10928/13	Sole	Sole	-		Complete
10929/13	Sole	-	-	Sole	Incomplete
10930/13	Sole	Sole	-		Complete
10931/13	Sole	-	-		Incomplete
10933/13	3	-	1-3		Complete
10934/13	Sole	-	SOle		Complete
10935/13	Sole	-	-		Complete
10936/13	Sole	-	V/A		Complete
10938/13	Sole	-	-		Incomplete
10939/13	Sole	-	V/A		Complete

10940/13	Sole	-	V/A		Complete
10941/13	Sole	-	-	-	Incomplete
10942/13	Sole	-	-	-	Incomplete
10943/13	Sole	-	-	-	Incomplete
11068/13	33	-	1-7,9-1 1,13-33	12,8	8 dead Complete. No steps has been taken on behalf of R-8 till date.
11069/13	Sole	V/A Sole	-		Complete
11072/13	Sole	V/A Sole	-		Complete
519/13	Sole	-	A.D. Card	-	Complete
523/13	Sole	-	-	Neither A.D	Incomplete
524/13	Sole	-	A.D. Card		Complete
8086/14	Sole	-	-	Neither A.D. Card Nor unserved cover	Incomplete
8103/14	Sole	-	-	Neither A.D. Card Nor unserved cover	Incomplete

CC Nos. 9303 of 2011, 6093 of 2012, 6483 of 2012, 6659 of 2012, 6829 of 2012, 6604 of 2012, 6800 of 2012, 6632-6633 of 2012, 17192 of

2011, 17193 of 2011, 17201 of 2011, 17204 of 2011, 17388 of 2011, 17507 of 2011, 17508 of 2011, 17534 of 2011, 17709 of 2011, 17711 of 2011, 17735 of 2011, 17798 of 2011, 17835 of 2011, 17846 of 2011, 17888 of 2011, 20144 of 2010, 13300 of 2012, 13044 of 2012, 12769 of 2012, 13114 of 2012, 15876 of 2011, CC 16190 of 2011, 16303, 16309, 16325 of 2011, 16326 of 2011, 16327 of 2011, 16350 of 2011, 16548 of 2011, 16580 of 2011, 16582 of 2011, 16594 of 2011, 16723 of 2011, 16850 of 2011, 16904 of 2011, 887 of 2012, 1147 of 2012, 1166 of 2012, 1168 of 2012, 1188 of 2012, 1200 of 2012, 1291 of 2012, 1303 of 2012, 1306 of 2012, 1391 of 2012, 1596 of 2012, 1657 of 2012, 1653 of 2012, 133 of 2012, 178 of 2012, 434 of 2012, 1637 of 2012, 1644 of 2012, 1739 of 2012, 1864 of 2012, 1869 of 2012, 1928 of 2012, 1935 of 2012, 2209 of 2012, 2798 of 2012, 2818 of 2012, 2821 of 2012, 2832 of 2012, SLP(C) 4822 of 2012, SLP(C) 6692 of 2012, CC nos. 10109 of 2012, 6861 of 2013, 19663 of 2011, 19552 of 2011, 19864 of 2011, 19556 of 2011, 19727 of 2011, 19527 of 2011, 19597 of 2011, 18960 of 2011, 18796 of 2011, 18834 of 2011, 18802 of 2011, 18805 of 2011, 20022 of 2011, 18526 of 2011, 18535 of 2011, 18525 of 2011, 18524 of 2011, 18310 of 2011, 18286 of 2011, 18423 of 2011, 18212 of 2011, 19580 of 2011, 18261 of 2011, 20048 of 2011, 19236 of 2011, 18536 of 2011, 18767 of 2011, 18769 of 2011, 19837 of 2011, 19599 of 2011, 19601 of 2011, 19590 of 2011, 18827 of 2011, 18630 of 2011, 20291 of 2011, 20454 of 2011, 20024 of 2011, 19116 of 2011, 18784 of 2011, 20794 of 2011, 20891 of 2011, 22257 of 2011, 22255 of 2011, 22256 of 2011, 2335 of 2013, **SLP(C) 33651 of 2011**, SLP(C) 35876 of 2011.

These matter were listed before the Hon'ble Court on 02.12.2011 etc. etc., when the Court was please to pass the following order:-

“List after the matter [S.L.P(C) NO. 24607/2010] is heard”

It is submitted that SLP(C)No. 24607/2010 was disposed by this Hon'ble Court on 02.08.2013, (Copy of Record of Proceedings dated 02.08.2013 already included in the paper books) as such the matters above mentioned are listed before the Hon'ble Court with this office

report.

Dated this the 9th day of October, 2014.

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

Copy to :- Mr. Nikhil Jain, Adv.
Mr. Ravindra Agrawal, Adv.
Mr. Kamal Mohan Gupta, Adv.
Mr. J.S. Chhabra, Adv.
Mr. Namita Chaudhary, Adv.
Mr. Balbir Singh Gupta, Adv.
Mr. A. Venayagam Balan, Adv.
Mr. S. K. Sabharwal, Adv.
Mr. Ajay Pal, Adv.
Ms. Kavita Wadia, Adv.
Dr. Monika Gusain, Adv.

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

Rajesh