

ITEM NO.6

REGISTRAR COURT. 2

SECTION III-A

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 SH. MASHROOR ALAM KHAN

Civil Appeal No(s). 8040/2019

THE STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH & ORS.

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

RAVINDRA NATH TAIGOR & ORS.

Respondent(s)

Date : 27-10-2025 This appeal was called on for hearing today.

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tyagi, AOR

For Respondent(s) :

Mr. Anjani Kumar Mishra, AOR
Mrs. Hardeep Kaur Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Praveen Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Krishna Gopal Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Arvind Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Sanchit Paney, Adv.

Mr. Chatanya Siddharth, Adv.
Mr. Kartikey, Adv.
Mr. Rameshwar Prasad Goyal, AOR

Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, AOR

Mr. Ilin Saraswat, Adv.
Ms. Ilma Saifi, Adv.
Mrs. Poonam Seth, Adv.
Mrs. Anita Rani Sharma, Adv.
Mr. M. M. Kashyap, AOR

Mr. Sumit Teterrwal, AOR
Mr. Ajay Choudhary, AOR

Mr. Hemant Kumar Tripathi, Adv.
Mr. Bharat Sangal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Nagarkatti Kartik Uday, AOR

M/S. Mukesh Kumar Singh And Co., AOR
 Ms. Komal Singh, Adv.
 Ms. Kajal Rani, Adv.
 Mr. Mukes Kumar Singh, Adv.
 Mr. Jeetendra Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Kadam Hans, Adv.
 Mr. C.m. Dwivedi, Adv.
 Mr. Savyasachi Dubey, Adv.

Mr. Purushottam Sharma Tripathi, AOR
 Mr. Amit, AOR
 Mr. Divyesh Pratap Singh, AOR

Ms. Ritu Reniwal, Adv.
 Mr. Ram Bhadauria, Adv.
 Mr. B.n. Dubey, Adv.
 Mr. Shekhar Chandra, Adv.
 Ms. Khushi Thawal, Adv.
 Ms. Esha thawal, Adv.
 Mr. Robin Khokhar, AOR

Mr. Rajendra Beniwal, Adv.
 Mr. Sunil Beniwal, Adv.
 Mr. Askrit Tiwari, Adv.
 Ms. Shivaka Jain, Adv.
 Mr. G. Deep Singh, Adv.
 Ms. Bano Deswal, Adv.
 Mr. R. C. Kaushik, AOR

Dr. Vinod Kumar Tewari, AOR
 Mr. Anantha Narayana M.G., AOR

Ms. Beena Singh, Adv.
 Ms. Nihstika Dwivedi, Adv.
 Ms. Pulkit, Adv.

Mr. Arvind Gupta, AOR
 Mr. Sumit Teterrwal, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
 O R D E R

Respondent No. 135 has been deleted vide Hon'ble Judge-in-Chambers order dated 30.09.2024.

As per Office report dated 21.03.2025, it was mentioned that Ld. Counsel for the appellant has filed Affidavit alongwith proof of service on brother of Respondent No. 81 and respondent No. 81 seems to be expired. Despite two opportunities Ld. Counsel for the appellant has not clarified whether the said respondent is expired or not. Hence, service is considered as incomplete.

Remaining respondents are duly represented/served.

Ld. Counsel for appellant has failed to take fresh steps and file fresh particulars to effect service on respondent Nos. 48(i) to 48(v), 228.1 and 228.2, though last opportunity was granted.

Hence, the matter be processed for listing before the Hon'ble Judge-in-Chambers, for further directions.

MASHROOR ALAM KHAN
Registrar

MG