

ITEM NO.101

COURT NO.6

SECTION IX

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

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 432 OF 2004

GREATER BOMBAY COOP. BANK LTD.

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

M/S. UNITED YARN TEX PVT. LTD.& ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for intervention, impleadment and prayer for interim relief and office report)

WITH

C.A. NO.434/2004 (With prayer for interim relief)

C.A. NO.433/2004 (With prayer for interim relief)

C.A. NO. 436/2004 (With appln.(s) for permission to file addl. documents and with office report)

SLP(C) NO. 15651-15652/2005 (With office report)

SLP(C) NO. 5592/2004 (With appln.(s) for permission to submit additional document (s) and with prayer for interim relief and office report)

SLP(C) NO.5598/2004 (With appln.(s) for directions and with prayer for interim relief)

SLP(C) NO. 5890/2004 (With appln.(s) for directions and with prayer for interim relief)

C.A. NO. 36/2006 (With office report)

C.A. NO. 37/2006 (With office report)

C.A. NO. 38/2006 (With office report)

C.A. NO. 916/2006 (With office report)

C.A. NO. 2819/2006

C.A. NO. 2820/2006

C.A. NO. 2821/2006

C.A. NO. 2822/2006

SLP(C) NO. 25246-25247/2005 (With appln.(s) for modification of Court's order and

with prayer for interim relief and office report)

C.A. NO.6069/2005 (With appln.(s) for impleadment and prayer for interim relief and office report)

C.A. NO. 6077/2005 (With prayer for interim relief and office report)

SLP(CRL.) NO.2071/2006 (With appln.(s) for c/delay in filing SLP, ad-interim ex-parte stay and office report)

W.P.(C) NO. 182/2006 (With appln.(s) for directions, impleadment, deletion of the

name of respondent and office report)

Date: 18/04/2007 This Appeal was called on for hearing today.

2

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.K. SEMA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.V. RAVEENDRAN

For Appellant(s) Mr. Siddhartha Chowdhury, Adv.

M/s. Lawyer's Knit & Co., Adv

CA 916/06 & 6077/05 Mr. Raghavendra S. Srivatsa, Adv.

Mr. Abhijat P. Medh, Adv.

Mr. K.N. Manjunath, Adv.

Mrs. D. Bharathi Reddy, Adv.

WP(C) 182/2006 Mr. A.M. Pattiyani, Adv.

Ms. Manju A. Pattiyani, Adv.

Mr. Ashwani Bhardwaj, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Bhargava V. Desai, Adv.

Mr. M.J. Paul, Adv

CA 2819/06 & 2822/06 Mr. Shekhar Naphade, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Satish Srivastava, Adv.

Ms. Shweta Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Balraj Dewan, Adv

Mr. D. Mahesh Babu, Adv

Mr. E.C. Agrawala, Adv.

CA 432/2004 & IA 8 Mr. H.S. Parihar, Adv

Mr. Kuldeep Parihar, Adv.

Mrs. Indu Malhotra, Adv.

Mrs. Asha G. Nair, Adv.

Mrs. B. Rajesh, Adv.

Mr. Rakesh K. Sharma, Adv.

Mrs. Manik Karanjawala, Adv.

Mr. Praveen Swarup, Adv.

CA 436/2004 Mr. Bhimrao N. Naik, Adv.

Mr. Shivaji M. Jadhav, Adv.

CA 436/04, R-2 in

SLP(C) 5598/04,

SLP(C) 5592/04

Mr. S.V. Deshpande, Adv.

Mr. Amit Yadav, Adv.

Mr. Jay Savla, Adv.

Mr. Sanjay V. Kharde, Adv.

Ms. Chandan Ramamurthi, Adv.

SLP(C) 5592/2005

Mr. Aniruddha P. Mayee, Adv.

Mr. T. Raja, Adv.

Mr. Sunil Kumar Verma, Adv.

Mr. T.V. Ratnam, Adv.

CA 36/2006

Mr. K. Maruthi Rao, Adv.

Ms. K. Radha, Adv.

Mrs. Anjani Aiyagari, Adv.

SLP(C) 2071/2006

Mr. V. Shekhar, Sr. Adv.

Mrs. Anjani Aiyagari, Adv.

Mrs. I. Madhavi, Adv.

Mr. K. Shivraj Choudhuri, Adv.

CA 38/2006

Mr. P.S. Narasimha, Adv.

Mr. Sridhar Potaraju, Adv.

Mr. D. Julius Reimai, Adv.

Mr. John Mathew, Adv.

CA 916/2006 &

Mr. A.V. Rao, Adv.

07 These appeals are allowed in terms of the signed order and the judgment dated 05/07/2005 of the Division Bench of the Andhra Pradesh High Court is set aside. The appeals, writ petitions and revision petitions are remitted back. Consequently, the High Court will now dispose of the writ appeals, writ petitions and civil revision petitions in accordance with law, in the light of the judgment reported in JT 20 (5) SC 201.

C.A. NO. 2819/2006 AND C.A. NO. 2821/2006

The appeals are dismissed in terms of the signed order. The appellant shall deposit 33.5% of Suit amount within three months.

C.A. NO. 2820/2006 AND C.A. NO. 2822/2006

2006 and In view of the order passed by us in C.A. Nos. 2819/2821/2006, these appeals do not survive and they are dismissed.

SLP(C) NO. 5598/2004

1 The question of law raised in this special leave petition is squarely covered by decision of a three-Judge Bench of this Court in Civil Appeal No.432/2004 & ors., Greater Bombay Co-op. Bank Ltd. Vs. M/s. United Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd. & Ors., reported in JT 2007 (5) SC 201,. Accordingly, the special leave petition is dismissed.

SLP(C) NO. 5890/2004

The question of law raised in this special leave petition is squarely covered by decision of a three-Judge Bench of this Court in Civil Appeal

No.432/2004 & ors., Greater Bombay Co-op. Bank Ltd. Vs. M/s. United Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd. & Ors., reported in JT 2007 (5) SC 201,. Accordingly, the special leave petition is dismissed.

SLP(C) NO. 5592/2004

The question of law raised in this special leave petition is squarely covered by decision of a three-Judge Bench of this Court in Civil Appeal

No.432/2004 & ors., Greater Bombay Co-op. Bank Ltd. Vs. M/s. United Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd. & Ors., reported in JT 2007 (5) SC 201,. Accordingly, the special leave petition is dismissed.

SLP(C) NOS. 15651-15652/2005

In view of the order by a three-Judge Bench of this Court in Civil Appeal No.432/2004 & ors., Greater Bombay Co-op. Bank Ltd. Vs. M/s. United Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd. & Ors., reported in JT 2007 (5) SC 201, these special leave petitions are dismissed, as having no merit.

W.P.(C) NO. 182/2006

The petitioner has challenged the validity of Section 101 of Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960 as being repugnant to Section 17 & 18 of Recovery of Debts Due to Banks and Financial Institutions Act, 1993 and for consequential reliefs. In view of the law laid down by a three-Judge Bench of this Court in Civil Appeal No.432/2004 & ors., Greater Bombay Co-op. Bank Ltd. Vs. M/s. United Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd. & Ors., (JT 2007 (5) SC 201), writ petition is dismissed.

C.A. NO. 2178 OF 2007 @ SLP(C) NOS. 25246-25247/2005

The issues raised in these appeals are covered by the decision of a three-Judge Bench of this Court in Civil Appeal No.432/2004 & connected

cases, Greater Bombay Co-op. Bank Ltd. Vs. M/s. United Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd.

& Ors. reported in JT 2007 (5) SC 201.

Following the said decision and in terms of it, these appeals are allowed and the order of the High Court is set aside.

7

CRL.A. NO. 631 OF 2007 @ SLP(CRL) NO. 2071/2006

The view taken by the High Court has been negatived by the recent decision by a three-Judge Bench of this Court in Civil Appeal No.432/2004 & ors. decided on 04/04/2007, Greater Bombay Co-op. Bank Ltd. Vs. M/s. United Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd. & Ors., (JT 2007 (5) SC 201).

In view thereof, this appeal is allowed. The impugned order of the High Court is set aside. The matter is remitted to the Special Court -cum- Metropolitan Sessions Judge who shall now proceed in accordance with law.

(Ravi P. Verma)

Court Master

(Anand Singh)

Court Master

[11 Signed orders are placed on the file]

8

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 432 OF 2004

GREATER BOMBAY COOP. BANK
LTD.

APPELLANT(S)

Versus

M/S. UNITED YARN TEX PVT.

RESPONDENT(S)

LTD. & ORS.

WITH

C.A. NO.433/2004; C.A. NO.434/2004 AND C.A. NO. 436/2004

O R D E R

Intervention/Impleadment applications dismissed.

These appeals by special leave are filed against the judgment

dated 12/12/2003 of the Bombay High Court allowing the writ

petitions filed by borrowers of Co-operative Banks incorporated under

the Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960 ('MCS', for short)

and Multi-State Co-operative Societies Act, 2002 ('MSCS Act', for

short). It upheld the contention of the borrowers that on and from

the date on which the Debt Recovery Tribunals were constituted

under the Recovery of Debts due to Banks and Financial Institutions

9

Act, 1993 ('Debt Recovery Act', for short) the Courts and Authorities

under the MCS Act and NSCS Act would cease to have jurisdiction to

entertain the applications submitted by the Co-operative Banks for recovery of their dues.

The question involved in these appeals is answered by a three-Judge Bench of this Court in Civil Appeal No.432/2004 & connected cases, Greater Bombay Co-op. Bank Ltd. Vs. M/s. United Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd. & Ors. reported in JT 2007 (5) SC 201, holding as follows:

"Co-operative banks' established under the Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960 [MCS Act, 1960]; the Andhra Pradesh Co-operative Societies Act, 1964 [APCS Act, 1964]; and the Multi-State Co-operative Societies Act, 2002 [MSCS Act, 2002] transacting the business of banking, do not fall within the meaning of 'banking company' as defined in Section 5(c) of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 [BR Act]. Therefore, the provisions of the Recovery of Debts Due to Banks and Financial Institutions Act, 1993 [RDB Act] by invoking the Doctrine of Incorporation are not applicable to the recovery of dues by the co-operatives from their members.

The field of co-operative societies cannot be
said to have been covered by the Central Legislation by

10

reference to Entry 45, List I of the Seventh Schedule of
the Constitution. Co-operative Banks constituted
under the Co-operative Societies Acts enacted by the
respective States would be covered by co-operative
societies by Entry 32 of List II of Seventh Schedule of
the Constitution of India."

In view thereof, the appeals are allowed and the judgment

dated 12/12/2003 of the Full Bench of the Bombay High Court is

set aside. Consequently, the High Court will now dispose of the

writ petitions in accordance with law, in the light of the judgment

reported in JT 2007 (5) SC 201.

.....J.

(H.K. SEMA)

New Delhi;

.....J.

April 18, 2007.

(R.V. RAVEENDRAN)

11

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 6069 OF 2005

THE PRUDENTIAL CO-OPERATIVE
BANK LTD.

APPELLANT(S)

Versus

G.S. CHAKRAPANI & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

WITH
C.A. NO. 6077/2005; C.A. NO. 36/2006; C.A. NO. 37/2006; C.A. NO.
38/2006 AND C.A. NO. 916/2006;

O R D E R

These appeals by special leave are filed against the judgment

dated 05/07/2005 of the Andhra Pradesh High Court allowing the

writ appeals, writ petitions and civil revision petitions filed by

borrowers of Co-operative Banks incorporated under the Andhra

Pradesh Co-operative Societies Act, 1964 ('Act', for short). It upheld

the contention of the borrowers that on and from the date on which the Debt Recovery Tribunals were constituted under the Recovery of Debts due to Banks and Financial Institutions Act, 1993 ('Debt Recovery Act', for short) the Courts and Authorities under the Act

12

would cease to have jurisdiction to entertain the applications submitted by the Co-operative Banks for recovery of their dues.

A three-Judge Bench of this Court has rejected the said contention in Civil Appeal No.432/2004 & connected cases, Greater Bombay Co-op. Bank Ltd. Vs. M/s. United Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd. & Ors. reported in JT 2007 (5) SC 201, holding as follows:

"Co-operative banks' established under the Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960 [MCS Act, 1960]; the Andhra Pradesh Co-operative Societies Act, 1964 [APCS Act, 1964]; and the Multi-State Co-operative Societies Act, 2002 [MSCS Act, 2002] transacting the business of banking, do not fall within the meaning of 'banking company' as defined in Section 5(c) of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 [BR

Act]. Therefore, the provisions of the Recovery of Debts Due to Banks and Financial Institutions Act, 1993 [RDB Act] by invoking the Doctrine of Incorporation are not applicable to the recovery of dues by the co-operatives from their members.

The field of co-operative societies cannot be said to have been covered by the Central Legislation by reference to Entry 45, List I of the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution. Co-operative Banks constituted under the Co-operative Societies Acts enacted by the respective States would be covered by co-operative

13

societies by Entry 32 of List II of Seventh Schedule of the Constitution of India."

In view of it, these appeals are allowed and the judgment

dated 05/07/2005 of the Division Bench of the Andhra Pradesh

High Court is set aside. The appeals, writ petitions and revision

petitions are remitted back. Consequently, the High Court will

now dispose of the writ appeals, writ petitions and civil revision

petitions in accordance with law, in the light of the judgment

reported in JT 2007 (5) SC 201.

.....J.
(H.K. SEMA)

New Delhi;J.
April 18, 2007. (R.V. RAVEENDRAN)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 631 OF 2007

[Arising out of SLP(CRL) No.2071/2006]

STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH APPELLANT(S)

Versus

BOORUGU MURALIDHAR & ORS. RESPONDENT(S)
ETC.

O R D E R

Leave granted.

The challenge in this appeal is to the order dated

14/09/2005 passed by the High Court of Andhra Pradesh in Criminal

Petition Nos. 3476 and 3489 of 2005 whereby the High Court

quashed the proceedings in CC.No.5/2003 on the file of the Special

Court-cum-Metropolitan Sessions Judge, Nampally, Hyderabad in so

far as the offence punishable under Section 5 of the Andhra Pradesh

Protection of Depositors of Financial Establishments Act 1999 ('Act',

for short) and issued a consequential direction to return the charge

sheet so as to enable the Deputy Superintendent of Police, C.I.D. Zone

15

to present the same before the appropriate court for the other offences

(under Section 120B, 420 & 409 of IPC). The High Court has taken

the aforesaid view on the premise that Co-operative Banks come

within the ambit of 'Banking Company' defined under Section 5(1)(c)

of Banking Regulation Act 1949 and that, therefore, such Banks are

not 'Financial Establishments' within the meaning of Section 2(c) of

the Act. The view taken by the High Court has been negatived by the

recent decision by a three-Judge Bench of this Court in Civil Appeal

No.432/2004 & ors. decided on 04/04/2007, Greater Bombay Co-op.

Bank Ltd. Vs. M/s. United Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd. & Ors., (JT 2007 (5) SC

201).

In view thereof, this appeal is allowed. The impugned order of the High Court is set aside. The matter is remitted to the Special Court-cum-Metropolitan Sessions Judge who shall now proceed in accordance with law.

.....J.

(H.K. SEMA)

New Delhi;

.....J.

April 18, 2007.

(R.V. RAVEENDRAN)

16

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 2178 OF 2007

[Arising out of SLP(C) No.25246-25247/2005]

THE GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA

APPELLANT(S)

PRADESH

Versus

M/S. HI-TECH INTEGRATED
SHRIMP CULTURE LTD. & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

Leave granted.

The State of Andhra Pradesh has filed these appeals by special leave challenging the judgment and order dated 05/07/2005 allowing W.P.No.5606/2000 and W.P. 16887/2003 (filed by respondents 1 and 2 in respective appeals) and holding that Co-operative Banks cannot approach the forums under the Andhra Pradesh Societies Act, 1964 for recovery of loan amounts and that they will have to approach the Debt Recovery Tribunals.

17

The issues raised in these appeals are covered by the decision of a three-Judge Bench of this Court in Civil Appeal No.432/2004 & connected cases, Greater Bombay Co-op. Bank Ltd. Vs. M/s. United

Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd. & Ors. reported in JT 2007 (5) SC 201.

Following the said decision and in terms of it, these appeals

are allowed and the order of the High Court is set aside.

.....J.
(H.K. SEMA)

New Delhi;J.
April 18, 2007. (R.V. RAVEENDRAN)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (C) NO. 182 OF 2006

MRS. SHIVANGI D. SHAH PETITIONER(S)

Versus

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & ORS. RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

The petitioner has challenged the validity of Section 101 of

Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960 as being repugnant to
Section 17 & 18 of Recovery of Debts Due to Banks and Financial
Institutions Act, 1993 and for consequential reliefs. In view of the
law laid down by a three-Judge Bench of this Court in Civil Appeal
No.432/2004 & ors., Greater Bombay Co-op. Bank Ltd. Vs. M/s.
United Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd. & Ors., (JT 2007 (5) SC 201), writ petition
is dismissed.

.....J.

(H.K. SEMA)

New Delhi;J.

April 18, 2007. (R.V. RAVEENDRAN)

19

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (C) NO.15651-15652 OF 2005

GOPAL SHETTY & ANR.

PETITIONER(S)

Versus

DEOGIRI NAGARI SAHAKARI

RESPONDENT(S)

BANK LTD. & ORS.

O R D E R

In view of the order by a three-Judge Bench of this Court in

Civil Appeal No.432/2004 & ors., Greater Bombay Co-op. Bank Ltd.

Vs. M/s. United Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd. & Ors., reported in JT 2007 (5)

SC 201, these special leave petitions are dismissed, as having no merit.

.....J.

(H.K. SEMA)

New Delhi;J.

April 18, 2007. (R.V. RAVEENDRAN)

20

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (C) NO.5592 OF 2004

KISHAN KRISHI UDYOG PVT. LTD.

PETITIONER(S)

Versus

O R D E R

The question of law raised in this special leave petition is

squarely covered by decision of a three-Judge Bench of this Court in

Civil Appeal No.432/2004 & ors., Greater Bombay Co-op. Bank Ltd.

Vs. M/s. United Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd. & Ors., reported in JT 2007 (5)

SC 201,. Accordingly, the special leave petition is dismissed.

.....J.

(H.K. SEMA)

New Delhi;

.....J.

April 18, 2007.

(R.V. RAVEENDRAN)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (C) NO.5890 OF 2004

Versus

DEPUTY REGISTRAR (II) CO-
OPERATIVE SOCIETIES & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

The question of law raised in this special leave petition is
squarely covered by decision of a three-Judge Bench of this Court in
Civil Appeal No.432/2004 & ors., Greater Bombay Co-op. Bank Ltd.

Vs. M/s. United Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd. & Ors., reported in JT 2007 (5)

SC 201,. Accordingly, the special leave petition is dismissed.

.....J.

(H.K. SEMA)

New Delhi;J.

April 18, 2007. (R.V. RAVEENDRAN)

ASHOK KUMAR AGRAWAL & ANR.

PETITIONER(S)

Versus

DEPUTY REGISTRAR (II) CO-
OPERATIVE SOCIETIES & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

The question of law raised in this special leave petition is
squarely covered by decision of a three-Judge Bench of this Court in

Civil Appeal No.432/2004 & ors., Greater Bombay Co-op. Bank Ltd.

Vs. M/s. United Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd. & Ors., reported in JT 2007 (5)

SC 201,. Accordingly, the special leave petition is dismissed.

.....J.

(H.K. SEMA)

New Delhi;

.....J.

April 18, 2007.

(R.V. RAVEENDRAN)

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 2819 OF 2006

SMT. SUDESH R. GUPTA & ORS.

APPELLANT(S)

Versus

PANCHSHEEL MERCANTILE CO-
OPERATIVE BANK LTD. & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

WITH

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 2821/2006

O R D E R

Challenge in this appeal is to the order dated 06/07/2004

passed by the High Court of Gujarat in Special Civil Applications No.

1885/2004 and 1888/2004. The respondent filed Summary Suits

under Section 99(4) of the Gujarat Co-operative Societies Act 1961.

The appellants filed defence applications. The Joint Registrar and

Member, Board of Nominees, Surat Division, Surat by orders dated

29/12/2003 dismissed the said defence applications. Aggrieved

thereby, the appellants preferred a Revision Nos.17/2004 and

18/2004 before the Gujarat State Co-operative Tribunal. The

Tribunal allowed the Revision Applications partly by order dated

24

13/01/2004 and the original authority was directed to grant leave to

defend on condition of payment of 33.5% of the Suit claim by the appellants.

Aggrieved thereby, the appellants filed writ petitions before the High Court of Gujarat. Two questions were raised before the High Court. Firstly, the Authority constituted under the State Co-operative Societies Act had no jurisdiction to entertain the suits after the establishment of Debt Recovery Tribunals under the Recovery of Debts due to Bankers and Financial Institutions Act, 1993. Secondly, the suits were barred by limitation. In view of decision by a three-Judge Bench of this Court in Civil Appeal No.432/2004 & ors., Greater Bombay Co-op. Bank Ltd. Vs. M/s. United Yarn Tex. Pvt. Ltd. & Ors., (JT 2007 (5) SC 201) the question of jurisdiction no more survives and the Authority under the Co-operative Societies Act does have jurisdiction. Regarding the second contention with regard to the

limitation, the High court has not decided the question of limitation but left it open to the Authority to decide in accordance with law. We find no reason to interfere with the same. Leave to defend has been allowed by payment of 33.5% of the Suit amount. If the appellant makes the payment of 33.5% of the suit amount, she shall be entitled to defend the suit and raise all contentions before the concerned

25

Authority including the plea of limitation.

Subject to the aforesaid clarification, the appeals are dismissed. The appellant shall deposit 33.5% of Suit amount within three months.

.....J.
(H.K. SEMA)

New Delhi;J.
April 18, 2007. (R.V. RAVEENDRAN)

26

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 2820 OF 2006

SMT. SUDESH R. GUPTA & ORS.

APPELLANT(S)

Versus

PANCHSHEEL MERCANTILE CO-
OPERATIVE BANK LTD. & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

WITH

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 2822/2006

O R D E R

In view of the order passed by us in C.A. Nos. 2819/2006 and

2821/2006, these appeals do not survive and they are dismissed.

.....J.

(H.K. SEMA)

New Delhi;

.....J.

April 18, 2007.

(R.V. RAVEENDRAN)