

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.2703 OF 2017

KRISHNA NAND YADAV & OTHERS APPELLANTS

VERSUS

MAGADH UNIVERSITY & OTHERS RESPONDENTS

WITH

C.A. No. 2793/2017

C.A. No. 2791/2017

C.A. No. 2790/2017

C.A. No. 2706-2715/2017

C.A. No. 2716-2756/2017

C.A. No. 2705/2017

C.A. No. 2760-2766/2017

C.A. No. 2767-2769/2017

C.A. No. 2758-2759/2017

C.A. No. 2757/2017

C.A. No. 2770/2017

C.A. No. 2775/2017

C.A. No. 2774/2017

C.A. No. 2771-2773/2017

C.A. No. 2776-2782/2017

C.A. No. 2783/2017

C.A. No. 2784/2017

C.A. No. 2785/2017

C.A. No. 2786/2017

C.A. No. 2787/2017

C.A. No. 2788-2789/2017

C.A. No. 2792/2017

O R D E R

1. The issue involved in the matter is of absorption of teaching and other non-teaching staff of the colleges taken over by the erstwhile State of Bihar in the said state and newly carved out State of Jharkhand and payment of salaries etc. This Court has passed an order dated 12.10.2001 appointing Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.C. Agrawal (Former Judge of this Court) as one man Commission to enquire into the following issues:

“1.How many sanctioned posts of teachers and non-teaching employees were there in the 40 colleges which were converted into constituent colleges pursuant to the sanction letter dated 19.08.1986.

2. How many proposal with regard to creation of posts for teachers and non-teaching employees had been submitted to the Education Department of the State of Bihar or University before 30.04.1986, the cut-off date mentioned in Appendix "Kha" (P.208 of SLP) with respect to 36 colleges converted into constituent colleges as per Government letter dated 19.08.1986? (List of colleges is at pp. 206-207 of SLP and other dates mentioned in Government communications in respect of four other colleges)?

3. How many teachers and non-teaching employees seeking absorption in the constituent colleges were not appointed

through selections made by the College Service Commission / University Services Commission and whether they possess the the-qualifications prescribed by the Act and Statutes? This exercise will be without prejudice to the contention of the respondents that Section 57-A is not applicable to such selection as has been held by the High Court in the Judgment?

4. How many teachers and non-teaching employees would be entitled to absorption the Government letter dated 19.08.1986 and Appendix 'Kha' and the agreement entered into between the University concerned and the constituent college under Section 4(14) of the Bihar State University Act, 1976 and other orders of Government?"

2. The matter has traveled to this Court in C.A. No.6098/1997. State of Bihar was bifurcated in the year 2000 and State of Jharkhand had been created. In the Report submitted by Mr. Justice S.C. Agrawal, it was observed:

“(i) Commission took notice of the fact that different cut-off dates for different affiliated colleges with reference to the dates on which decision to convert them into constituent colleges, were specified by the State, being 30.04.1986 or 31.03.1987 or 01.06.1987, as the case may be. The Commission identified the number of sanctioned posts and the members of the staff working against each of them. It submitted separate reports in respect of one minority institution wherein, however, neither any cut-off date was specified nor determined.

(ii) The Commission, furthermore, divided the second term of reference into two parts and answered each of them separately. Identification of each college was made which had sent proposals with regard to creation of additional posts, and which had been submitted by the concerned universities to the Human Resources Department of the State before the cut-off date.

Separate identifications were also done by the Commission in

regard to proposals for creation of additional posts submitted by each college before the cut-off date and which were pending consideration before the concerned universities.

(iii) The revised list submitted by the screening committee dated 30-01-1987, containing the names of the employees recommended for absorption, was held not worthy of acceptance. Interpolations and tampering with the records were found by the Commission. It was held that the screening committee, without assigning any reason, could not have submitted a revised list to include some more names or exclude others, and thus the same deserved no consideration.”

3. This Court earlier decided the matter in “State of Bihar v. Bihar Rajya MSESKK Maha Sangha” reported in 2005 (9) SCC 129. This Court has observed as:

“73. In view of this judgment and the directions made herein to the university to take a final decision based on the report of the Enquiry Commission, all the applications for impleadment as parties and objections filed to the enquiry report are rejected. It is for the university to take a final decision concerning the individual employees. For the same reason, no further orders are required on the interlocutory applications seeking certain directions pending the appeal and for modification of earlier orders made. Other interlocutory applications also need no further directions or orders. They all stand disposed of.

Conclusions

1. the judgment of the High Court to the extent of the interpretation placed by it on the provisions of section 4(I) (14) and section 35 with the directions issued in paragraphs 24 to 26 therein, is hereby confirmed for the reasons recorded by us above.

2. The report of the Commission of enquiry of Hon. Mr. Justice S.C. Agrawal [retired] is accepted and all objections filed against the said report are rejected.

3. The members of the staff in various affiliated colleges identified and named in list no.(i) being appointees against the sanctioned posts shall be absorbed and formal order to that effect shall be issued by the universities concerned.

4. The universities shall take a decision under section 4(I) (14) of the Act in the matter of absorption of appointees names in list no. (ii) of the Report of the Commission, being appointees against posts for which recommendations were sent by the universities to the State up to the cut-off date in accordance with the decision of the State Government conveyed in its letter dated 19.08.1986 followed by letters dated 25.08.1986 and 12.06.1987.

In considering the question of absorption of appointees named in list no. (ii) of the report of the Enquiry Commission, the universities concerned shall rely on the contents of the report of the enquiry commission and the present judgment of this Court.

5. The appointees mentioned in list no.(iii), being the appointees against posts for which recommendations were sent by the universities to the State Government after the cut-off date or those working against posts for which no recommendations were for approval of the State Government, have no right of being considered for absorption -whatever may be the fortuitous circumstances or otherwise in the matter of not sending recommendations for sanction in their cases. The negative report of the enquiry commission with regard to list no.(iii) is accepted and the universities are directed to exclude all such appointees named in list no.(iii) from consideration for absorption.

6. A large number of objections to the Report of the Enquiry Commission filed before us by associations of employees and individuals pertain to the alleged lack of prescribed qualifications for the posts on which they are working. All those objectors have not been recommended for absorption in the report of the Enquiry Commission. Decision in individual

cases, with due regard to the qualifications of each employee and corresponding statute applicable at the relevant time prescribing qualifications, if any, for the teaching and non-teaching posts, shall be taken by the universities based on the findings in the report of Mr. Justice Agrawal Commission and in the light of the legal position explained above.

The universities concerned shall now complete the process of absorption of the staff of the affiliated colleges [teaching and non-teaching] in the manner and to the extent stated above in our judgment within four months from the date of receipt/production of the copy of this order."

4. There are a few subsequent events which have taken place. In Contempt Petition on 03.08.2007, order was passed by this Court directing that :

"A large number of teachers are involved in this case and several universities are parties to these proceedings, in the interest of justice, it would be just and proper that these petitions be considered by the High Court of Judicature at Patna / Jharkhand and see whether the judgment passed by this Court be complied with.

The applications/contempt petitions are disposed of accordingly. The relevant papers be transmitted to the respective High Courts"

5. Thereafter, there was a second round of litigation and Full Bench of Patna High Court appointed a Two-Man Commission to advert to following terms of reference :

"(i) The employees whose names figured in List – III as has been held by Apex Court in subparagraph-5 of paragraph 73 shall stand excluded.

(ii) The Commission shall adjudge the cases of each of the employees on the anvil of the Justice Agrawal Commission

Report and the decision in Mahasangh case (supra), especially keeping in view the paragraphs 61 to 64 and paragraphs 73 and 74.

(iii) The Commission shall also look into the cases of non-teaching staff on the anvil of the judgment passed in Mahasangh case (supra) and the recommendations of Justice Agrawal Commission.

(iv) Each of the writ Petitioners shall file their requisite brief before the Commission. The Registrar of the Universities shall produce all relevant records as directed by the Commission failing which they shall be liable for contempt of this Court.

(v) The Commission shall carry out the exercise and finalize the matter by the end of June 2010.”

6. Later on, in Special Leave Petitions preferred in this Court certain orders were passed. On 22.01.2013, this Court again appointed Mr. Justice S.C. Agrawal to enquire into the following issues :

“a) The Commission shall adjudge the claim of each of the employees (both teaching and nonteaching) for absorption in constituent colleges on the anvil of Justice Agrawal Commission report dated 10.12.2001 and the decision of the Supreme Court in State of Bihar vs. Bihar Rajya MSESkk Maha Sangha, 2005 (9) SCC 129

b) Each of the Writ Petitioners shall file their requisite brief with all the details and the basis of claiming absorption before the Commission within four weeks with advance copies to (I) concerned university, (ii) Principal Secretary, Higher Education, State of Bihar, and (iii) standing Counsel for State of Bihar in Supreme Court. No claim

made thereafter shall be entertained.

c) The concerned university and the State of Bihar shall file their response within 4 weeks, thereafter;

d) The present order shall relate only to cases which have been disposed of by the Patna High Court vide judgment and order dated 11.03.2010 in LPA No.1304 of 2009 and connected matters.

In addition to the same, the persons who were not a party are also permitted to make their representation before the Commission.

For the above-said purpose, the Commission has to issue a notification in the local daily prescribing four weeks time for filing their representation.

e) The registrar of the Universities shall produce all the records as directed by the Commission."

As Mr. Justice S.C. Agrawal declined to enquire, thereafter, Hon'ble Mr. Justice S.B. Sinha (Retd.) had been appointed on 19-08-2013 as One Man Commission to enquire and submit a report.

7. An elaborate adjudication process had been undertaken by Justice Sinha. The decisions and various orders passed by this Court have been taken into consideration including the Government Order dated 18.12.1989. The cases of incumbents holding the posts, which were recommended prior to the cut-off date, have been accepted. The Commission has rejected the cases in which recommendations had been made after the cut-off date. After going into each and every case, decisions have been rendered following the due procedure of adjudication and permitting them to file their documents. In the report following

observations have been made by the Commission after hearing the parties :

“149. It must be acknowledged that Mr. B.L. Hansaria, Ld. Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the State, sometime after the hearing of the Commission stated and once the cases pertaining to a particular college was taken up in terms of a consensus arrived at, placed before the Commission, charts furnishing requisite necessary particulars contained in the Claims of the respective Claimants and respective stands of the State and the universities. The Claims Petitions of the teaching staff were taken one after the other subject wise. Similarly, cases of the non-teaching staff were taken up category wise as far as possible.

150. The Ld. Counsel for the University and the State had been supplied with hard copies of such charts and ordinarily, the Commission proceeded to take up the matters on the basis thereof.

151. The concerned universities as also the Ld. Counsels for the Claimants, however, used to bring to the notice of this Commission any mistake/error, which might have crept in the said chart. Moreover, the facts/documents and pleadings, which were necessary for the purpose of effective adjudication of the Claim Petitions, were also brought to the notice of the Commission.

152. Even after Mr. Joel, started representing the State after Mr. Hansaria and Mr. Abhinav Mukerji, stopped appearing before the Commission, the said practice continued. Such charts were found to be useful.

153. The Claim Petitions filed by the teachers and non-teaching staff could have been disposed of within a reasonable time if, as had been directed by Hon'ble the Supreme Court of India, the Registrars of the Universities produced the records at the hearing and the learned counsel for the parties argued on the basis thereof.

154. Unfortunately, the University as also the state expressed their inability to produce the records. The Claimants, despite the fact that according to the University no record was available with them, inter alia, filed letters purported to have been issued by the

Universities to the State of Bihar recommending for creation of additional posts.

Genuineness of such letters having been questioned, opportunities had to be given to the State and/or Universities to take instructions in the matter and file necessary affidavits. Thus, the process of obtaining instructions or filing affidavits and rejoinder thereto took a long time.

155. The Claimants also from time to time filed additional affidavits annexing therewith additional documents, with regard where to, the state and the universities had to be given opportunities to seek instructions. Such a process, therefore, also consumed a lot of time.

156. It is a matter of some concern as to how the Claimant could file a large number of documents including the correspondence between the universities and the State, the latter expressed their inability to do so although, in most of the cases, the universities accepted the genuineness of the said documents.

157. The State of Bihar filed documents after obtaining copies thereof from the Vigilance Department in certain cases. It is difficult to comprehend as to why the State of Bihar could not take back the documents seized by the Vigilance Department or file the copies thereof made from such records, so as to enable the Commission to know the entire/correct facts. In some cases, however, even such records have been produced.

158. In certain matters, having regard to the fact that all the records had not been produced before it, the Commission directed the universities to submit reports within the time specified but most of the universities filed such reports only at the end of the hearing. In some cases, it was found that such reports are not complete or the issues wherefor such reports were called for have not sufficiently been addressed.

159. Some of the Claimants filed objections to the said reports

although the cases have been disposed of, which were generally not entertained.

160. The State of Bihar filed two applications for direction only on 09.08.2016, which were taken up for hearing on 10.08.2016.

161. The total number of Claim Petitions of teaching and non-teaching staff so far as universities situated within the state of Bihar is concerned is 1660 and those situated within the State of Jharkhand is 359 (Total Number).”

8. We have heard learned counsel appearing for the State of Bihar and Mr. Vijay Hansaria on behalf of the State of Jharkhand. They have urged four-fold objections as follows :

1. After the Orders passed by this Court, the Committees constituted by the States of Jharkhand and Bihar have taken into consideration the cases to absorb teachers and non-teaching staff of the constituent colleges with respect to whom the recommendations have been made by the Commission in the State of Jharkhand. Out of 154 recommendations, 98 have been accepted; but with respect to 56 incumbents recommendations have not been accepted. In the State of Bihar, 96 teaching staff recommendations have been accepted, and with respect to non-teaching staff 159 recommendations have been accepted. It was submitted by learned counsel that as a matter of fact, the posts had not been recommended for creation before cut of date. Correspondence has been relied upon by the Commission to hold creation of posts which could not have been relied upon for holding that these posts which were recommended before the cut of date.

2. It was also submitted that the agreement of taking over of the institutions between college and University, contains the list of those

employees also who were working in the institutions as on the date of taking over of the same. Thus, Commission has relied upon on certain lists which were not correct.

3. In relation to the incumbents whose recommendations had not been accepted by the State Governments, it was submitted that it was so for the reason that there was no material on record to show that they had been paid salary by the institutions on the date of taking over of the colleges.

4. It was further submitted that even as regards certain posts which had fallen vacant on account of death or attaining the age of superannuation or due to transfer, the Commission had recommended to State Governments to accommodate the incumbents, which could not have been done.

9. Coming to the first submission raised by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State of Bihar and the State of Jharkhand with respect to the recommendation of the posts before the cut of date. Facts in I.A. No.460 of 2017 have been mainly relied upon. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the State of Jharkhand with respect to the other similar cases also, has pointed out that in Abdul Bari Memorial (ABM) College, 18 posts of Class III were sanctioned by the State Government. Out of these 18 Class III posts, 9 posts (up to serial No.5) were of clerical staff including head clerk, accountant etc. There was no recommendation of posts to the Government up to the cut of date. Justice Agrawal had recommended in his Report 13 number of Class III posts eligible for absorption. The names of the present claimants were neither mentioned by Justice Agrawal in his Report nor in order of the Government issued on 01.02.1988 and 12.02.1990. The claimants filed their claim petitions before the Commission seeking absorption of their services. The claimants, in the claim petition, relied upon two letters of the University dated 25.04.1981 and 02.07.1982

written to the State Government, whereby the University had allegedly recommended 41 posts of non-teaching staff be created.

10. However, there were no averments on the claims filed by incumbents that these recommendations were received by the State Government. Lists have been placed on record along with the interlocutory applications. The two letters dated 25.04.1981 and 02.07.1982 have been placed on record along with the interlocutory applications. It is mentioned in the applications that University, in their reply dated 19.03.2014 before the Commission, has categorically stated that “no recommendation was sent by the college or by the University to the Government and no proposal was pending before the University sent by the college”. The affidavit filed by the respondent has been placed on record. It is also mentioned in the application that the aforesaid two letters of University were not filed before Justice Agrawal Commission and they have not filed before this Court also. The Commission, now, has allowed claims of 10 Class III routine clerk employees and has directed their absorption in the services of University. Thus, an error had been committed while relying upon aforesaid letters of the University for holding the creation of posts. Thus, it was submitted that the Action of the State Government was appropriate in not accepting the recommendations made by the Commission. No case for further indulgence by this Court is made out.

11. On the other hand, when we consider the orders passed by Commission, Justice Sinha in his Order dated 23.01.2013 has observed that although claims for 41 posts of Class III were sanctioned, the same could not be furnished by the University before Justice Agrawal Commission. Further, it was stated that University had itself filed an affidavit before this Court stating therein that the cases of 13 employees were left out in the Report of the Justice Agrawal

Commission. The University in its affidavit filed in March 2003 submitted before Justice Agrawal Commission stated as under :

“10. That so far as non-teaching staffs are concerned there are total 14 persons in grade III and 20 persons in grade IV who have been appointed on sanctioned posts the details of the individual concerned.”

12. The University has taken a stand before Justice Sinha's Commission that cases of the claimants are covered by the same affidavit. But the State of Jharkhand urged that prayer made earlier had not been accepted by this Court and, therefore, the contentions of the Claimants, as well as that of the University, should not have been accepted by the Commission. However, claimants had produced requisite breakup of all the posts before the Commission, and in further averments made in the affidavit filed before Justice Agrawal himself, as also filed in this Court, it was stated that 13 persons had been left out of non-teaching staff of Grade III and that the same was for the consideration of this Court as per law. The relevant averments made in the affidavit filed by the University is as under :

"The university is herewith annexing the list of the said 13 left out non-teaching staffs of Grade III of A.B. M. College, Jamshedpur for consideration of this Hon'ble Court as per law and the same is annexed herewith and marked as Annexure RA."

A list of non-teaching staff working before 30.04.1986 contained 13 names of incumbents, who were left out at the time of the order passed by Mr. Justice S.C. Agrawal. University had not disputed the authenticity of the relevant documents filed by claimants.

13. This court has directed to consider the individual cases of the concerned employees to the Commission. This Court has referred to Section 4 (1) (14) of the

Bihar University Act 1976 and observed in the case of Mahasangh (Supra) as under :

“72. In some of the written objections, certain mistakes of names and descriptions of employees in the report of the Commission have been pointed out. Such mistakes in the report of the Commission may be brought by the affected employees to the notice of the universities concerned. It would be open to the universities, for the above-limited purpose to undertake enquiry and verification of the records to rectify and rely upon the report of the Commission with the necessary corrections only with regard to the names and descriptions of the employees.

73. In view of this judgment and the directions made herein to the university to take a final decision based on the report of the Enquiry Commission, all the applications for impleadment as parties and objections filed to the enquiry report are rejected. It is for the university to take a final decision concerning the individual employees. For the same reason, no further orders are required on the interlocutory applications seeking certain directions pending the appeal and for modification of earlier orders made. Other interlocutory applications also need no further directions or orders. They all stand disposed of.”

Thus, Justice Sinha has observed that University was empowered to issue the necessary orders. The only grievance of the claimants was that they were not getting their salary on the basis of 5th and 6th Pay Revision Committee of the University Grants Commission

(UGC). Only certain claimants' cases were accepted by Justice Sinha Commission and it has been ordered that respondents to ensure that the claimants be paid their salary as per the law from the date on which their services had been regularized.

14. In view of the factual matrix, the orders of accepting cases passed by Justice Sinha Commission are fully in accordance with law and the exercise undertaken by Justice Sinha cannot be said to be in violation of either the Reports of Justice Agrawal or the decision of this Court in Mahasangha case (supra). It was the decision in the case of Mahasangha (supra) that cases of individuals were required to be examined and thereafter, under the aforesaid terms of reference, Commission was required to decide individual cases. Thus, we find that the objections raised by the State of Bihar and the State of Jharkhand, refusing to accept the orders, cannot be accepted.

15. Apart from that, in one such case, vide order dated 04.01.2015, Justice Sinha in the matter of ASJSN College, with respect to non-teaching staff, has made an elaborate consideration into all these aspects, and the similar view has been taken by Justice Sinha in the other cases. The objection raised with respect to other cases also does not survive. Thus, the first submission does not survive and is hereby rejected. Even in grey areas which were left for consideration by the Commission, the view adopted is wholly justified and is in accordance with the law, we are in agreement with the same.

16. Coming to the second objection. It is submitted that in the agreement of taking over of the colleges, certain manipulations were done so as to benefit incumbents in the list. We find that Justice Sinha Commission has taken into consideration all these aspects in individual cases as apparent from its various orders and, therefore, only those cases have been recommended in which it was

found, on due consideration of the matter, that the appointments were not made on the basis of any manipulation or procured on the basis of illegal documents. The view taken by the Commission is based on meticulous consideration of cases cannot be said to be vitiated or illegal in any manner whatsoever.

17. Coming to the third objection raised with respect to certain candidates that they were not, in fact, working on the date of taking over. The Commission has taken into consideration these aspects and has clearly recorded findings only after going into the factual aspects of individual matters on the basis of documents only then cases have been decided. Thus, we find no infirmity or illegality in the same.

18. Coming to the fourth objection raised by learned counsel for the States with respect to the recommendations against the vacancies created by death or superannuation. We find that Justice Sinha has taken meticulous care in this regard while making recommendations as to whether the incumbents were working before the cut of date or not at the relevant time, and only thereafter recommendations have been made. With the passage of time, the factual scenario was bound to change including who held the post at the particular point of time. Therefore, the recommendations made are appropriate and in accordance with law.

19. Coming to objection that some posts which had fallen vacant due to the transfers have been ordered to be given to the incumbents who were found eligible. We find that this Court has made reference to Commission to examine the individual claims and they have been examined and considered in the orders passed by the Commission and that transfers were bound to happen after lapse of

reasonable time would not defeat the rights of person to hold the posts. As such, for aforesaid reasons, thus, we find the objection to be untenable.

20. In our opinion, the incumbents with respect to whom the favorable direction have been made by Justice Sinha, have to be acted upon by State Governments, and as such, they be implemented forthwith without any further delay within the outer limit of three months.

21. With respect to the cases of incumbents not found fit for acceptance by the Commission. They are free to approach the concerned High Court, as prayed, for redressal of their grievance, if they so desire. In case petitions are filed before the High Courts, it is expected that petitions would be dealt with as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of one year.

22. It is observed, as prayed by the counsel for the appellants that the chart which has been submitted contains some errors. Therefore, the State Governments have to go by the recommendations made and not to treat the chart as final.

23. Though we have directed the recommendations made to be acted upon, yet the incumbents who have been recommended, shall furnish the declaration that they had been continuously working and attending the college regularly since the date of appointment till date, or in case of retirement till the date of retirement, and that did not work elsewhere.

24. It is made clear that in the cases where recommendations have not been made, we have not gone into the merits of such cases. All questions with respect to

the incumbents whose cases have been rejected by Justice Sinha Commission are kept open.

25. In the cases where Justice Sinha has referred the matter to the University, it may take prompt action in the matter, as directed within a period of three months.

26. Accordingly, the Civil Appeals are disposed of including pending applications.

**.....J.
[ARUN MISHRA]**

**.....J.
[MOHAN M. SHANTANAGOUDAR]**

**NEW DELHI;
AUGUST 31, 2017.**

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). 2703/2017

KRISHNA NAND YADAV & ORS.

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

MAGADH UNIVERSITY & ORS.

Respondent(s)

With

(IA No.78801/2017-PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS and
IA No.82544/2017-I A FOR OBJECTION and IA
No.82545/2017-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA
No.82549/2017-APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS)

WITH

C.A. No. 2784/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2785/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2786/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2787/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2706-2715/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2716-2756/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2705/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2792/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2793/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2791/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2790/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2760-2766/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2767-2769/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2758-2759/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2757/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2788-2789/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2770/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2775/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2774/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2771-2773/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2776-2782/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2783/2017 (XVI)

C.A. No. 2794/2017 (XVI)

(and IA No.60786/2017-impleading party)

C.A. No. 2704/2017 (XVI)

Date : 31-08-2017 These appeals were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MISHRA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MOHAN M. SHANTANAGOUDAR

For Parties

Mr. Nidhesh Gupta, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Neeraj Shekhar, AOR

Mr. Animesh Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Ashutosh Thakur, Adv.

Mr. Sumit Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Guru Saran Mourya, Adv.

Ms. Radha Takkar, Adv.

Mr. V. Giri, Sr. Adv.

Ms. Manjula Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Prem Sunder Jha, AOR

Mr. K. Radhakrishnan, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Braj Kishore Mishra, Adv.

Ms. Aparna Jha, Adv.

Mr. Abhishek Yadav, Adv.

Mr. Karan Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Huzefa A. Ahmadi, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Devendra Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. Prem Sunder Jha, Adv.

Mr. Vijay Hansaria, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Gopal Prasad, Adv.

Mr. Avnish Pandey, Adv.

Mr. Rakesh K. Khanna, Sr. Adv.

Ms. Shefali Jain, Adv.

Ms. Mahima Rathi, Adv.

Mr. S. Busha Kazim, Adv.

Mr. Mohit Nagar, Adv.

Mr. Rana Mukherjee, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Manish Kumar Saran, Adv.

Mr. Bijay Kumar Sinha, Adv.

Mrs. Anjana Prakash, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Shishir Pinaki, Adv.

Mr. Rajiv Kumar Sinha, Adv.

Dr. Prabhat Kumar,Adv.

Dr. Pratyush N.,Adv.

Ms. Poonam Kumari,Adv.

Mr. N. Rai,Adv.

Ms. Prerna Singh,Adv.

Mr. S. Prem Chandra,Adv.

Mr. Sukumar,Adv.

Mr. Aishwarya Sinha,Adv.

Mr. Himanshu Chaubey,Adv.

Mr. Rana Ranjit Singh,Adv.

Mr. Vivek,Adv.

Mr. D. N. Goburdhan, AOR

Mr. Joel,Adv.

Ms. Namita Choudhary,Adv.

Ms. Kritika Khurana,Adv.

Mr. Harshul Singh,Adv.

Mr. Devesh Kumar Tripathi, Adv.

Mr. Gopal Singh, AOR

Mr. Ajay Kumar,Adv.

Mr. Kundan Kr. Mishra,Adv.

Mr. Brajesh Kumar,Adv.

Mr. Rajeev Sharma,Adv.

Mr. Rupesh Kumar,Adv.

Ms. Pankhuri Shrivastava,Adv.

Mr. Ajay Sharma,Adv.

Mr. Harshvardhan Jha,Adv.

Mrs. Yugandhara Pawar Jha,Adv.

Mr. Subodh Kumar Jha,Adv.

Mr. Abhishek Chaudhary,Adv.

Mr. Ajay Kr. Taleshra,Adv.

Mr. Shishir Pinaki,Adv.

Mr. Rajiv Kumar Sinha,Adv.

Mr. Atul Jha,Adv.

Mr. Sandeep Jha,Adv.

Mr. Dharmendra Kumar Sinha,Adv.

Mr. Anupam Lal Das,Adv.

Mr. Anirudh Singh,Adv.

Mr. Krishanu Barua,Adv.

Mr. Chandra Prakash,Adv.

Mr. L.R. Singh,Adv.

Mr. Sudhanshu Kumar Choudhary,Adv.

Mr. Anirudh P. Mayee,Adv.

Mr. Binay Kumar Das,Adv.

Mr. Sanjay Kumar Lal Das,Adv.

Ms. Priyanka Das,Adv.

Mr. Manoj Kumar,Adv.

Mr. Imran Alam,Adv.

Mr. Vijay Kr. Pandey,Adv.

Dr. Kailash Chand,Adv.

Mr. Jayesh Gaurav,Adv.

Ms. Diksha Ojha,Adv.

Mr. T. Mahipal,Adv.

Mr. Sanjeev Kumar,Adv.

Mr. Rajnish,Adv.

Ms. Saumya Sinha,Adv.

Mr. Nitesh Rana,Adv.

Mr. Manish Jain,Adv.

Mr. Saket Singh,Adv.

Ms. Sarvshree,Adv.

Ms. Sangeeta Singh,Adv.

Mr. Varinder Sharma,Adv.

Mr. R.R. Rajesh,Adv.

Mr. Brajesh Kumar,Adv.

Mr. Y.K. Parshad,Adv.

Ms. Parul Sharma,Adv.

Mr. Sunil Lala,Adv.

Mr. Sukumar,Adv.

Ms. Ansha Varma,Adv.

Mr. Rakesh Kumar Singh,Adv.

Mr. Prem Prakash,Adv.

Mr. Santosh Mishra,Adv.

Mr. Varinder Kumar Sharma,Adv.

Mr. Yugal Kishore Prashad,Adv.

Ms. Parul Sharma,Adv.

Ms. Shraddha Saran,Adv.

Mr. Ardhendumauli Kumar Prasad,Adv.

Ms. Taruna Ardhendumauli Prasad,Adv.

Mr. Namit Saxena,Adv.

Mr. Nitesh Ranjan,Adv.

Mr. Amritesh Raj,Adv.

Mr. Anshuman Ashok,Adv.

Mr. Sanjeev Kumar,Adv.

Mr. Rajnish, Adv.

Mr. H.K. Naik, Adv.

Mr. P.S. Nerwal, Adv.

Mr. S. K. Mishra, Adv.

Mr. S. K. Verma, Adv.

Mr. Ram Ekbal Roy, Adv.

Mr. Sunil Jha, Adv.

Mr. Subodh Kr. Jha, Adv.

Ms. Vijayalaxmi Jha, Adv.

Mr. Shekhar Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Praveen Chandra, Adv.

Mr. Mehul Milind Gupta, Adv.

Mr. R.P. Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Mithilesh Kr. Singh, Adv.

Mrs. Manju Singh, Adv.

Mr. Jaigop B., Adv.

Mr. Anil Kumar Jha, Adv.

Ms. Vijayalaxmi Jha, Adv.

Mr. Vinoy Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Rahul Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Deepak Anand,Adv.

Mr. R. Abhay Kumar,Adv.

Mr. Vineet Kumar Singh,Adv.

Mr. Himanshu,Adv.

Mr. Amit Kumar Singh,Adv.

Mr. Abhas Mishra,Adv.

Mr. Amol N. Suryawanshi,Adv.

Mr. R. Chandrachud,Adv.

Mr. Nipin Thukral,Adv.

Mr. Manish Kumar S.,Adv.

Mr. Naveen Kr. Singh,Adv.

Mr. C.B. Prasad,Adv.

Mr. R. Chandrachud,Adv.

Mr. Nitin Thukral,Adv.

Mr. Manish K. Sharan,Adv. (N/P)

Mr. Sumit Kumar,Adv.

Mr. S.K. Divakar,Adv.

Mrs. Kumari Supriya,Adv.

Mr. Ram Kumar Tripathi,Adv.

Mrs. Rina Kumari,Adv.

Mr. Jamnesh Kumar,Adv.

Mr. Abhishek Vikas, AOR

Mr. Shishir Pinaki, AOR

Mr. Binay Kumar Das, AOR

Mr. Mohit Kumar Shah, AOR

Mr. Debasis Misra, AOR

Mr. Prem Prakash, AOR

Mr. Manish Kumar Saran, AOR

Mr. Anshuman Ashok, AOR

Mr. Abhishek Chaudhary, AOR

Mr. Chandra Prakash, AOR

Mr. Ambhoj Kumar Sinha, AOR

Mr. C. D. Singh, AOR

Mr. D. N. Goburdhan, AOR

Mr. Rajesh Prasad Singh, AOR

Mr. Gopal Singh, AOR

Mr. Aniruddha P. Mayee, AOR

Mr. Abhinav Mukerji, AOR

Mr. Lakshmi Raman Singh, AOR

Mr. Gopal Prasad, AOR

Mr. Rajeev Singh, AOR

Mr. Binay Kumar Das, AOR

Mr. Kailash Chand, AOR

Mr. Dharmendra Kumar Sinha, AOR

Mr. Rameshwar Prasad Goyal, AOR

Mr. Kundan Kumar Mishra, AOR

Mr. Narendra Kumar, AOR

Mr. Neeraj Shekhar, AOR

Mr. Brajesh Kumar, AOR

Mr. Ambhoj Kumar Sinha, AOR

Mr. T. Mahipal, AOR

Mr. Ajay Kumar Talesara, AOR

Mr. Manish Kumar Saran, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Civil Appeal No.2794 of 2017 is detagged and list after a week.

C.A. No.2704 of 2014 is detagged.

Civil Appeals are disposed of including pending applications in terms of the Signed Order.

(RASHI GUPTA)

(TAPAN KUMAR CHAKRABORTY)

SENIOR PERSONAL ASSISTANT

BRANCH OFFICER

[SIGNED ORDER IS PLACED ON THE FILE]