

PETITIONER:
M. POORNACHANDRAN & ANR.

Vs.

RESPONDENT:
STATE OF TAMIL NADU & ORS.

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 06/11/1996

BENCH:
K. RAMASWAMY, B.L. HANSARIA, S.B. MAJMUDAR

ACT:

HEADNOTE:

JUDGMENT:

O R D E R

The record of the appeal indicates that Shri Sudarsh Menon was the Advocate-on-Record when the appeal was heard and decided on merits. The Review Petition has been filed by Shri Prabir Chowdhury who was neither an arguing counsel when the appeal was heard nor was he present at the time of arguments. It is unknown on what basis he has written the grounds in the Review Petition as if it is a rehearing of an appeal against our order. He did not confine to the scope of review. It would be not in the interest of the profession to permit such practice. That part, he has not obtained "No Objection Certificate" from the Advocate-on-Record in the appeal, in spite of the fact that Registry had informed him of the requirement for doing so. Filing of the "No Objection Certificate" would be the basis for him to come on record. Otherwise, the Advocate-on-Record is answerable to the Court. The failure to obtain the "No Objection Certificate" from the erstwhile counsel has disentitled him to file the Review Petition. Even otherwise, the Review Petition has no merits. It is an attempt to reargue the matter.

On these grounds, we dismiss the Review Petition.