

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 M.A. SAYEED

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).8672/2012

BRIJ LAL

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for c/delay in filing SLP and office report)

with

SLP(C) No.8672,8673,1916-2058 and 10857/2012

(with office report)

Date: 30/01/2014 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Pradeep Dahiya, Adv.

Mrs Shiel Sethi, Adv.

Mr. Ambuj Agarwal, Adv.

Ms. Anubha Agrawal, adv.

Mr. Aftab Ali Khan, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Govind Goel, Adv.

Mr. Mohan Lal Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Tarun Gupta, Adv.

Ms. Shiel Sethi, Adv.

Mr. Rishi Malhotra, Adv.

Mr. R.C. Kaushik, Adv.

Mr. Govind Goel, Adv.

Dr. Kailash Chand, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

SLP(C) No.8672/2012

It is pertinent to note that respondent No.1 is common respondent in the other connected matters also wherein it has been properly served and duly represented, through the learned Advocates, therefore, he is deemed to be properly

Item No.35

-2-

served in the present matter also and since there is no appearance on his behalf, he is ordered to proceed ex parte.

Counter affidavit on behalf of respondent No.2 has already come on record.

Respondent No.3 has been already deleted from the array of the respondents, as per the order of the Hon'ble Court dated 2.3.2012.

The matter would fall under the completed category.

Further necessary orders to be passed as and when the other connected matters would become ready.

SLP(C) No.8673/2012

It is pertinent to note that respondent Nos.1 and 2 are common respondents in the other connected matters also wherein they have been properly served and duly represented, through the learned Advocates, therefore, they are deemed to be properly served in the present matter also and since there is no appearance on their behalf, they are ordered to proceed ex parte.

Counter affidavit on behalf of respondent No.3 has already come on record.

Respondent Nos.4 to 8 have been already deleted from the array of the respondents, as per the order of the Hon'ble Court dated 2.3.2012.

No further steps required.

Further necessary orders to be passed as and when the other connected matters would become ready.

SLP(C) Nos.1916-2058/2012

In this batch of matters, the duly represented respondents are granted four weeks' time, as final chance, for filing counter affidavit.

Registry to take a proper note regarding the status of the respondents whose counter affidavit has already come on record.

So far as the unserved respondents are concerned, fresh notice be issued through the concerned District Court in addition to postal service.

Considering there is a batch of 143 matters, filing of the spare copies stands dispensed with.

A perusal of the office report indicates that in some of the matters, the respondents have passed away and application for substitution seems to have been filed which is suffering from certain defects as pointed out in the office report. These defects be cured within four weeks and on compliance, Registry to process the applications for substitution, as per rules.

In some of the matters, steps for substitution of the legal representatives of the deceased respondents are yet to be taken. Necessary steps be taken within four weeks and on compliance, the same be processed as per rules.

In this batch of matters, HUDA is a common party who seems to have filed proper vakalatnama and counter affidavit in all 52 SLPs. However, there seems to be deficiency of court fee of Rs.406/-. In these 52 matters, the same be rectified within four weeks. Similarly, in the remaining 91 matters, the application for impleadment has been filed which is again suffering from deficit court fee of Rs.810/-. The same be rectified within four weeks.

On compliance, the applications be processed, as per rules.

SLP(C) No.10857/2012

Respondent No.1 is common in the other connected matters also wherein it has been properly served and duly represented. Therefore, he is deemed to be properly served in the present matter also and since there is no appearance on his behalf, he is ordered to proceed ex parte.

The remaining respondents are duly served through post but none appeared on their behalf.

Further necessary orders to be passed as and when the other connected matters would become ready.

List again on 15.4.2014.

		(M.A. SAYEED)
		REGISTRAR