

ITEM NO.55

COURT NO.4

SECTION IV-C

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 19957/2024

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 23-07-2024 in RP No. 211/2024 passed by the High Court of Madhya Pradesh at Indore]

MUKESH MURLIDHAR SOMANI

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

AALOOPYAJ COMMISSION AGENTS ASSOCIATION &amp; ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 239784/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 194198/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 239769/2024 - VACATING STAY)

IA No. 292360/2024 FOR IMPLEADMENT

Date : 03-01-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HRISHIKESH ROY

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.V.N. BHATTI

For Petitioner(s) Dr. Harsh Pathak, Adv.  
Ms. Shaveta Mahajan, AOR  
Mr. Mohit Choubey, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Ms. Ruchi Kohli, Sr. Adv  
Mr. A. K. Chauhan, Adv.  
Mr. Amit Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Shashank Shekhar, AOR

Mr. Sarvam Ritam Khare, AOR  
Mr. Abhinav Dhanodkar, Adv.  
Mr. Kushagra Sharma, Adv.  
Mr. Anuj Agarwal, Adv.

Mr. Prabhat Kumar Rai, AOR  
Mrs. Nidhi Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Keshav Khandelwal, Adv.

Mr. Shyel Trehan, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Dhananjay Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Sumit Kumar, Adv.  
Ms. Vidhi Jain, Adv.

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

Heard Dr. Harsh Pathak, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner. Also heard Ms. Ruchi Kohli, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the respondent.

2 Notice in this case was issued on 06.09.2024 on the projection that the petitioner is a garlic farmer.

3. However, in the counter affidavit and application for vacating stay, filed by the respondent No.1, it is pointed out that the petitioner is also a Trader of garlic and not just a farmer.

4. When specific query was raised to Dr. Harsh Pathak on what is the petitioner's vocation, the counsel concedes that the petitioner is also a trader besides being a farmer.

5. The above would suggest that incorrect projection was given before this Court on the petitioner being just a garlic farmer. This was wrong.

6. In the above circumstances, we are of the view that the interim order passed by us on 06.09.2024, needs to be vacated. The same is accordingly vacated. The IA (No. 239769/2024) for vacating stay is allowed.

7. Heard Ms. Shyel Trehan, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the impleader. The IA (IA No. 292360/2024) for impleadment is allowed. The respondents are impleaded as respondent(s). The cause title be amended accordingly.

6. The learned counsel for the other parties pray for and are granted four weeks' time to file their respective response.

(DEEPAK JOSHI)  
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(KAMLESH RAWAT)  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR