

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.286 OF 2012

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

..APPELLANTS

VERSUS

HARI CHAND & ORS.

..RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

1. In this appeal, the State of Haryana calls in question only that portion of the order passed by the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh in Civil Writ Petition No. 17463 of 2009 dated 22.12.2008, wherein, the policy of the State Government dated 26.10.2007 has been struck down on the ground that the same is arbitrary and violates Article 14 of the Constitution of India and is also contrary to the provisions of Land Acquisitions Act, 1894 (for short, 'the Act').

2. The State Government had issued a notification under Section 4 of the Act for acquiring lands in Sectors 49 and 50 in Gurgaon for the purpose of developing residential and commercial areas under the Haryana Urban Development Authority Act, 1977 (for short, 'the HUDA Act'). This was followed by a declaration under Section 6 of the Act.

3. The respondents had moved an application for the grant of license to establish group housing projects for certain extent of

land acquired by the Government. Since the said application was rejected by the Competent Authority, the respondents filed a writ petition challenging the notifications issued under Sections 4 and 6 of the Act for establishing a group housing colony in Sectors 49 and 50 and also the rejection of its application. The High Court has come to the conclusion that the policy framed by the State Government, dated 26.10.2007 pursuant to the directions issued by the High Court in *M/s. Unitech Ltd. & Anr. v State of Haryana & Ors* for release of land from acquisition proceedings under certain circumstances is against the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, for the reason, that, after the notification under Section 4 of the Act, withdrawal from the acquisition under Section 48 is contrary to the provisions of the Act and therefore any such transfer of land in favour of the private parties/owner is not permissible and further it has clarified that merely because licenses have been granted in favour of few licensees, it may not be granted to all other licensees. It is this portion of the impugned order is the subject matter of this appeal.

4. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties to the *lis*.

5. Dr. Abhishek Singhvi, learned senior counsel appearing for the State of Haryana would submit that in the Writ Petition filed, there was no challenge by the petitioner, *inter alia*, questioning the vires of the policy of the State Government dated 26.10.2007. He would add that in the pleadings before the High Court, the

respondents had not specifically taken the ground insofar as the vires of the policy of the State Government is concerned. In support of this contention, the learned counsel has taken us through the prayers made in the Writ Petition as well as the grounds that were urged by the petitioners in the Writ Petition filed before the High Court. Apart from this, the learned senior counsel would submit that the High Court, without assigning, proper and cogent reasons, could not have come to the conclusion that the policy of the State Government is arbitrary and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. In aid of this submission, the learned senior counsel has taken us through the judgment and order passed by the High Court.

6. *Per contra*, Shri Akhil, learned counsel appearing for the respondents would submit that in the Writ Petition filed before the High Court, they had primarily questioned the action of the State Government in releasing certain lands acquired to some of the landholders whereas the same treatment is not given to the respondents. It is on this premise the respondents had approached the High Court for appropriate reliefs and also had taken up several other grounds in aid of the prayers sought for in the Writ Petition.

7. We have carefully gone through the prayers in the Writ Petition and also the grounds urged. We have also carefully seen the judgment and order passed by the High Court.

8. The relevant portion of the prayer in the Writ Petition is as under:-

"ii) issue a writ of certiorari, quashing the notifications under Sections 4 and 6 dated 3/3/2003 and 2/3/04 respectively and the award passed on 20/12/06 under the Land Acquisition Act and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom in relation to the land of the petitioners;

iii) issue a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to grant license to the petitioners for setting up a cyber park, for which an application stands submitted and scrutiny fee and license fee already stands paid, which is under active consideration of the respondents."

9. The petitioners had sought for a writ in the nature of *Certiorari* for quashing the notification issued by the State Government acquiring certain extent of lands by issuing notification under Sections 4 and 6 of the Act. The other prayer is with regard to non-grant of licenses to the petitioners.

10. Even after looking summarily to the grounds and the prayers made in the Writ Petition collectively, it was nowhere contended that the policy of the State Government is arbitrary and violates Article 14 of the Constitution of India. In such a scenario, in our opinion, the High Court ought not to have ventured to go into the correctness or otherwise of the policy of the State Government.

11. Apart from the above, the learned Judges of the High Court, while holding that the policy of the State Government dated 26.10.2007 is arbitrary and violates Article 14 of the Constitution of India, have not assigned any reasons whatsoever. In the absence of such reasons, the High Court could not have come to the conclusion that the policy of the State Government is arbitrary and

therefore, it violates Article 14 of the Constitution of India. In our opinion, an order which contain no reasons is no order in the eye of law.

12. Shri Akhil, learned counsel appearing for the respondents would submit that in the Writ Petition filed, they had specifically pleaded arbitrariness and vindictiveness that was shown by the appellant while rejecting the reasonable request of the petitioners by giving certain examples where the State Government had granted certain benefits to certain persons by releasing the lands after it was notified under Sections 4 of the Act. This aspect of the matter is not noticed or considered by the High Court. Even this aspect of the matter will be now looked into by the High Court.

13. In view of the above, the judgment and order of the High Court cannot be sustained by us. In the result, we allow this appeal, set aside that portion of the order passed by the High Court where the High Court has given its opinion on the validity of the policy of the State Government and remand the matter back to the High Court for fresh disposal in accordance with law, after affording opportunity of hearing to both the parties.

14. We permit the writ petitioners, if they so desire, to amend the prayers made in the Writ Petition subject to the objection that may be raised by the State Government.

15. The order of "status quo" passed by this Court with respect to possession shall enure to the benefit of the Writ

Petitioners during the pendency of the Writ Petition before the High Court.

16. All the contentions of both the parties are kept open to be agitated before the High Court. No costs.

17. The applications filed for impleadment are allowed to be withdrawn, with liberty to make an appropriate application before the High Court within two months time from today. If such an application is filed, the High Court would consider the same in accordance with law.

Ordered accordingly.

.....J.
(H.L. DATTU)

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 10, 2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.354-364 OF 2012

HARI CHAND & ORS.

..APPELLANTS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

..RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

1. In view of the orders passed in C.A.No.286 of 2012 today, the impugned judgment and order is set aside and the matters are remanded to the High Court for fresh disposal in accordance with law after affording opportunity of hearing to all the parties. The Civil Appeals are disposed of accordingly.

2. We also reserve liberty to the appellants, if they so desire, to take up all further contentions if the same is available to them.

3. The order of "status quo" regarding possession passed by this Court shall enure to the benefit of the Writ Petitioners during the pendency of the Writ Petition before the High Court.

Ordered accordingly.

.....J.
(H. L. DATTU)

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 10, 2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.389-397 OF 2012

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

..APPELLANTS

VERSUS

SATNAM SINGH & ORS.

..RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

In view of the orders passed in Civil Appeal No.286 of 2012, these appeals are also disposed of in the same terms, observations, conditions and directions contained therein.

Ordered accordingly.

.....J.
(H. L. DATTU)

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 10, 2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.311 OF 2012

TEK RAM

..APPELLANT

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

..RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

1. This appeal is directed against the order vacating the 'Status Quo' granted earlier by the Writ Court in the Writ Petition filed by the appellant.

2. This Court, while entertaining the appeal, had granted "Status Quo of Possession".

3. After disposal of Writ Petition No.17463 of 2007, dated 22.12.2008 the Court has vacated the interim order granted earlier by its order dated 20.01.2009.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the parties to the *lis* inform us that the Writ Petition filed by the appellant-herein is still pending before the High Court for its consideration and decision. If that is so, in our opinion, the only relief that can be granted to the appellant while disposing of this appeal is to request the High Court to dispose of the Civil Writ Petition No.9364 of 2007 in accordance with law without reference to the observations

made by the High Court in Civil Writ Petition No.17463 of 2007.

5. Accordingly, we dispose of this appeal with a request to the High Court to dispose of the Writ Petition No.9364 of 2007 in accordance with law without reference to the observations made in Civil Writ Petition No.17463 of 2007.

6. All the contentions of both the parties are kept open.

Ordered accordingly.

.....J.
(H. L. DATTU)

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 10, 2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.687 OF 2011

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

..APPELLANTS

VERSUS

RAJYOGA EDUCATION & RESEARCH
FOUNDATION ORS.

..RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

In the light of the orders passed by us in Civil Appeal No.689 of 2011, nothing survives in this Civil Appeal for our consideration and decision. The Civil Appeal is disposed of as having become infructuous.

Ordered accordingly.

.....J.
(H. L. DATTU)

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 10, 2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.672-673 OF 2011

M/S.INTIME PROMOTERS PVT.LTD.
& ORS.

..APPELLANTS

VERSUS

BHARPAI & ORS.

..RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

In view of the orders passed in Civil Appeal No.689 of 2011, these appeals are also disposed of in the same terms, observations, conditions and directions contained therein.

Ordered accordingly.

.....J.
(H. L. DATTU)

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 10, 2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.695-696 OF 2011

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

..APPELLANTS

VERSUS

NARAYAN SINGH & ORS.

..RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

In view of the orders passed in Civil Appeal No.689 of 2011, nothing survives in these appeals for our consideration and decision. The Civil Appeals are disposed as having become infructuous.

Ordered accordingly.

.....J.
(H. L. DATTU)

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 10, 2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.582-583 OF 2011

M/S.B.G.AGRITECH P.LTD.

..APPELLANT

VERSUS

SHIV SHANKAR RICE &
GEN. MILLS & ORS.

..RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

1. Shri Ankur Chawla, learned counsel appearing for the appellant submits that he has already filed an application before this Court for withdrawal of the Civil Appeals and therefore seeks permission of this Court to withdraw the Civil Appeals.

2. Permission sought for is granted and the Civil Appeals are disposed of as withdrawn.

Ordered accordingly.

.....J.
(H.L. DATTU)

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 10, 2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.701 OF 2011

M/S.ASCENT TOWNSHIP PVT. LTD. ..APPELLANT

VERSUS

TARA CHAND & ORS. ..RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

In view of the orders passed in Civil Appeal No.689 of 2011, this appeal is disposed of in the same terms, observations, conditions and directions contained therein.

Ordered accordingly.

.....J.
(H.L. DATTU)

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 10, 2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.877-879 OF 2011

M/S.DLF HOMES PANCHKULA
(P) LTD. & ORS.

..APPELLANTS

VERSUS

TARA CHAND & ORS.

..RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

In view of the orders passed in Civil Appeal No.689 of 2011, these appeals are also disposed of in the same terms, observations, conditions and directions contained therein.

Ordered accordingly.

.....J.
(H.L. DATTU)

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 10, 2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.685-686 OF 2011

M/S.EDEN SLF RESIDENCY ..APPELLANT

VERSUS

JOGINDER SINGH & ORS. ..RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

In view of the orders passed in Civil Appeal No.689 of 2011, these appeals are also disposed of in the same terms, observations, conditions and directions contained therein.

Ordered accordingly.

.....J.
(H.L. DATTU)

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 10, 2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.581 OF 2011

PARGAT SINGH & ORS.

..APPELLANTS

VERSUS

M/S.NATIONAL RICE & GEN.
MILLS & ORS.

..RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

In view of the orders passed in Civil Appeal No.689 of 2011, this appeal is also disposed of in the same terms, observations, conditions and directions contained therein.

Ordered accordingly.

.....J.
(H.L. DATTU)

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 10, 2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.881 OF 2011

M/S.BADERWAL INFRA
PROJECTS PVT. LTD.

..APPELLANT

VERSUS

MAHABIR PRASAD & ORS.

..RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

In view of the orders passed in Civil Appeal No.689 of 2011, this appeal is also disposed of in the same terms, observations, conditions and directions contained therein.

Ordered accordingly.

.....J.
(H.L. DATTU)

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 10, 2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.652 OF 2011

M/S.SUMITRA BUILDERS &
DEVELOPERS PVT. LTD.

..APPELLANT

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

..RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

In view of the orders passed in Civil Appeal No.689 of 2011, this appeal is also disposed of in the same terms, observations, conditions and directions contained therein.

Ordered accordingly.

.....J.
(H.L. DATTU)

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 10, 2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.689 OF 2011

M/S. INTIME PROMOTERS PVT. LTD. ..APPELLANT

VERSUS

RAJYOGA EDUCATION AND RESEARCH
FOUNDATION AND ORS. ..RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

1. This appeal is directed against the judgment and order passed by the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh in Civil Writ Petition No.15777 of 2004, dated 26.3.2009. In this case the appellant is aggrieved only that portion of the impugned order at paragraph 13.

2. The appellant before us was impleaded as one of the parties to the proceedings in Civil Writ Petition No.15777 of 2004 by Application No.1526 of 2009.

3. The contention of the Writ Petitioners in Civil Writ Petition No.15777 of 2004 was that the State Government was not justified in releasing the land in favour of the appellant after its acquisition. Taking note of that aspect of the matter, the High Court, by its interim order has passed the following order :

"In the circumstances, we direct that operation and effect of release of land in favour of added parties will remain stayed and no third party rights will be created by the added parties. Status quo as on today will be maintained till further orders."

4. Aggrieved by the aforesaid portion of the order passed by the High Court, as we have already noticed, the appellant is before us in this appeal.

5. This Court, while entertaining the Special Leave Petition, by its order dated 12.05.2009 has granted interim stay of the impugned order passed by the High Court until further orders. The said interim order is still operating in favour of the appellant herein.

6. We are informed by both the learned counsel appearing for the parties that the Writ Petition, namely, Civil Writ Petition No.15777 of 2004 is still pending before the High Court. If that is, we now request the High Court to dispose of the aforesaid Writ Petition in accordance with law after affording opportunity of hearing to all the parties concerned, including the impleaded parties. All the contentions of both the parties are kept open to be agitated before the Writ Court itself.

7. The interim order granted by this Court earlier shall enure to the benefit of the appellant till the disposal of the Civil Writ Petition No.15777 of 2004.

.....J.
(H. L. DATTU)

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 10, 2013

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.573 OF 2011

M/S.GAURI REALTORS PVT. LTD. & ORS.

APPELLANTS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

1. In view of the orders passed in C.A.No.689 of 2011 today, this appeal is also disposed of in the same terms, observations, conditions and directions contained therein.

Ordered accordingly.

.....J.
(H.L. DATTU)

.....J.
(MADAN B. LOKUR)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 10, 2013

ITEM NO.36

COURT NO.4

SECTION IV

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

CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 286 OF 2012

STATE OF HARYANA & ORS.

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

HARI CHAND & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for directions,intervention)

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 354-364 OF 2012

(With appln. for permission)

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 389-397 OF 2012

CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 830 OF 2011

(With appln(s) for permission to file addl.documents and
prayer for interim relief and office report)

(FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.886/2011 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR C/DELAY IN FILING SLP AND
OFFICE REPORT)

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 573 OF 2011

(With office report)

C.A. NO. 381/2012

C.A. NO. 384/2012

C.A. NOS. 790-791/2012

C.A.No.688/2011

(WITH APPLN.(S) FOR PERMISSION TO PLACE ADDL. DOCUMENTS ON
RECORD AND WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF)

(FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.577/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL
DISPOSAL)C.A.No.687/2011(WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE
REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.582-583/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.581/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.834/2011 (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.701/2011 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS AND WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.697-698/2011 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDL. DOCUMENTS AND WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.672-673/2011 WITH APPLN.(S) FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS AND WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)(FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.695-696/2011 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS AND WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.829/2011 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS AND WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.685-686/2011(WITH APPLN.(S) FOR SUBSTITUTION AND EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. AND C/DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN. AND DELETION OF THE NAME OF RESPONDENT AND WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.652/2011(WITH APPLN.(S) FOR SUBSTITUTION AND DIRECTIONS AND C/DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN. AND PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS AND VACATING/MODIFICATION OF THE INTERIM ORDER OF STAY AND OFFICE REPORT)

C.A.No.881/2011 (WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)

C.A.No.889/2011 (WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)

C.A.No.877-879/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT)

C.A.No.875-876/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.31147/2010 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDL. DOCUMENTS AND WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.1628/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT)

C.A.No.833/2011 (WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.25510/2010 (WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)

C.A.No.2897/2011

SLP(C)No.6285/2011 (WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.5618/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.5622/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.5624/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.5626/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.5649/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.11280/2010 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR C/DELAY IN FILING SLP AND WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.1088/2011 (WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.1310/2011 (WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.14408/2011 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR C/DELAY IN FILING SLP AND OFFICE REPORT)

C.A.No.885/2011 (WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.887/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT)
(FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A. No. 313/2012

C.A. No. 314/2012

C.A.No.654/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT)
(FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.653/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT)
(FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.791/2011 (WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.787/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT)
(FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.828/2011 WITH APPLN.(S) FOR LEAVE TO PLACE ON RECORD THE SUBSEQUENT DEVELOPMENTS AND WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)(FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.888/2011 (WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.880/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.1006/2011 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR STAY AND OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.1014/2011 RAJINDER (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR STAY AND OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.1017/2011 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR STAY AND IMPLEADMENT AND OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.989/2011 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR STAY AND OFFICE REPORT)(FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.1009/2011 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR STAY AND OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.1015/2011 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR STAY AND OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.992/2011 LUXMI DUTT (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR AND STAY AND IMPLEADMENT AND OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.990/2011 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR STAY AND IMPLEADMENT AND OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.700/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.832/2011 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. AND WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.1379/2011 (FOR PREL. HEARING) (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR DIRECTIONS AND WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT) (FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

C.A.No.835/2011 (WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)

C.A.No.882/2011 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR PERMISSION TO PLACE ADDL. DOCUMENTS ON RECORD AND WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)(FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

SLP(C)No.3207/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.22171-22172/2011 (WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF
AND OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.28096-28098/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.27306-27308/2011 (WITH OFFICE REPORT)

C.A. NO. 668/2011
(WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)

C.A. NO. 689/2011
(WITH APPLN. FOR DELETION OF PROFORMA RESPONDENTS AND PRAYER
FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.27743/2010
(WITH APPLN. FOR DISCHARGE OF ADVOCATE ON RECORD AND PRAYER
FOR INTERIM RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.23519-23520/2013
(WITH APPLN. FOR SUBSTITUTION AND WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM
RELIEF AND OFFICE REPORT)

SLP(C)No.22657/2011
(WITH APPLN. FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDL. DOCUMENTS AND OFFICE
REPORT)

SLP(C)NO.22151/2008
(WITH APPLN.(S) FOR STAY AND WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF
AND OFFICE REPORT)
(FOR FINAL DISPOSAL)

WITH C.A.NO.836/2011 (WITH APPLN.(S) FOR VACATING STAY AND
WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF)

S.L.P. (C) NO. 4993/2010
(With office report)

C.A. NO. 311/2012
(With appln(s). for permission to file lengthy list of dates)

C.A. No. 671/2012

Date: 10/12/2013 These Appeals were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.L. DATTU
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MADAN B. LOKUR

For Appellant(s) Mr. Harish Salve, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Ankur chawla, Adv.
 Mr. Sarvesh Singh Baghel, Adv.
 Mr. Rahul Pratap, Adv.
 Mr. Yogesh Dalviya, Adv.
 Mr. M.L. Sharma, Adv.
 for M/S. "Coac", Adv.

Mr. Kavin Gulati, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Ankur chawla, Adv.
 Mr. Sarvesh Singh Baghel, Adv.
 Mr. Rahul Pratap, Adv.
 Mr. Yogesh Dahiya, Adv.
 for M/s Coac, Adv.

Mr. Mukul Rohtagi, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Ankur chawla, Adv.
 Mr. Sarvesh Singh Baghel, Adv.
 Mr. Rahul Pratap, Adv.
 for M/s Coac, Adv.

Mr. M.L. Sharma, Adv.
 For Mr. S.K. Sabharwal, Adv.

Mr. Punit Dutt Tyagi, Adv.

Mr. Ankur Chawla, Adv.
 Mr. Sarvesh Singh, Adv.
 Mr. Rahul Pratap, Adv.
 for M/s Coac, Adv.

Mr. Harish Salve, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Ankur chawla, Adv.
 Mr. Sarvesh Singh Baghel, Adv.
 Mr. Rahul Pratap, Adv.
 Mr. Yogesh Dahiya, Adv.
 for M/S. "Coac", Adv.

Mr. S.B. Sanyal, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Naveen Kr. Sharma, Adv.
 Mr. J.S. Maratha, Adv.

Mr. Arun Monga, Adv.
 Mr. Aviral Dhirendra, Adv.
 Ms. Sunita Sharma, Adv.
 Mr. D.K. Monga, Adv.

Mr. Arun Monga, Adv.
 Mrs. Naresh Bakshi, Adv.

Mr. Mohd. Shahid Anwar, Adv.
 Mr. Syed Rehan, Adv.

Mr. P. Vishwanath Shetty, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Aseem Mehrotra, Adv.
 Mr. A.P. Medh, Adv.

Mr. Shiv Shankar Panicker, Adv.

Mr. Harish Salve, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Alok Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Abhayveer Sharma, Adv.
 Mr. Amit Kumar Dadhich, Adv.
 Mr. Ramesh Thakur, Adv.
 Mr. Amit Agnihotri, Adv.
 Mr. Mohan Lal Sharma, Adv.

For Appellant(s) / Dr. Abhishek M. Singhvi, Sr. Adv.
 Respondent(s) Mr. Narender Hooda, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Manjit Singh, AAG.
 Mr. Sanjay Rathi, Adv.
 Ms. Shaitali Y Dhinaja, Adv.
 Ms. Nupur Chaudhary, Adv.
 Mr. Surender Singh Hooda, Adv.
 Dr. Sudhir Bisla, Adv.
 Mrs. Sumitra Bisla, Adv.
 Dr. Monika Gusain, Adv.
 Mr. Jitender, Adv.
 Mr. Vikas, Adv.
 Mr. N. Ahmed Khan, Adv.
 Ms. Chaitali Y. Dhinoja, Adv.
 Mr. Tarjit Singh, Adv.
 for Mr. Kamal Mohan Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Brij Bhusan, Adv.

Mr. Guru Krishna Kumar, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Satinder S Gulati, Adv.
 Mrs. Kamaldeep Gulati, Adv.

Mr. Satinder S. Gulati, Adv.
 Mrs. Kamaldeep Gulati, Adv.

Mr. Subramonium Prasad, Adv.
 Mr. Vijay Nair, Adv.
 Mr. Lalan Sinha, Adv.
 Mr. K.V. Rathee, Adv.
 Mr. Yudhishtir Singh, Adv.

Mr. H.N. Salve, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Mukul Rohtagi, sr. Adv.
 Mr. Pravin Bahadur, Adv.
 Ms. Mallika Joshi, Adv.
 Mr. Amit Agarwal, Adv.
 Ms. Nimita Kaul, Adv.
 Mr. Rajan Narain, Adv.

Ms. Madhu Moolchandani, Adv.

Mr. Jasbir Singh Malik, Adv.
 For Mr. S.K. Sabharwal, Adv.

For Appellant(s)/ Dr. Sukhdev Sharma, Adv.
 Respondent(s) Mr. V.K. Vasdev, Adv.
 Ms. Sunita Kaushik, Adv.
 For Dr. Kailash Chand, Adv.

Mr. S.K. Bansal, Adv.
 Ms. Savitri Bansal, Adv.
 Dr. Kailash chand, Adv.

Mr. M.L. Sharma, Adv.
 Mr. Dinesh Verma, Adv.
 Dr. Kailash Chand, Adv.
 Mr. Subhasish Bhowmick, Adv.

Mr. Ranbir Singh Yadav, Adv.
 Ms. Anzu K Varkey, Adv.
 Mr. P. Kakra, Adv.
 Mr. Puran Mal Saini, Adv.

Mr. Govind Goel, Adv.
 Dr. Kailash Chand, Adv.
 Mr. M.L. Sharma, Adv.
 Ms. Naresh Bakshi, Adv.
 Mr. Sanjay Kumar Yadav, adv.
 Mr. Ankit Goel, Adv.

Mr. Satyapal Khushal Chand Pasi, Adv.
 Mr. Tilak Raj Pasi, Adv.

Mr. Prateek Jalan, Adv.
 Mr. Nikhil Singhvi, Adv.
 Mr. Anurag Mishra, Adv.
 For Mr. Yash Pal Dhingra, Adv.

Mr. Rishi Malhotra, Adv.
 Mr. Prem Malhotra, Adv.
 Mr. Vishnu Bhagwan Ranga, Adv.

Mr. Shyam Divan, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. C. Mukund, Adv.
 Mr. Ashok Jain, Adv.
 Mr. Pankaj Jain, Adv.
 Mr. Bijoy Kumar Jain, Adv.
 Mr. B.R. Sabharwal, Adv.

Ms. Ruby Singh Ahuja, Adv.
 Ms. Deepti Sarin, Adv.
 Mr. Rohit Sharma, Adv.
 Mr. Karan, Adv.
 For Ms. Manik Karanjawala, Adv.
 for M/S. Karanjawala & Co., Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Kumar Kartikay, Adv.
 Mr. Himanshu Singh Dhillon, Adv.
 For Mr. Aruneshwar Gupta, Adv.

Mr. V.V.S. Rao, Sr. Adv.
 Ms. B.K. Lata, Adv.
 Mr. Bhargava V Desai, Adv.
 Mr. Shreyas Mehrotra, Adv.
 Mr. Gajendra Maheshwari, Adv.
 Ms. Vijayshree Pattaniak, Adv.
 Mr. Anil, K., Adv.

Mr. Parag P. Tripathi, Sr. Adv.
 Ms. Vishnupriya Sainath, Adv.

Mr. Harish N. Salve, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Parag P. Tripathi, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. A.D.N. Rao, Adv.
 Mr. Atul Sharma, Adv.
 Mr. A. Venkatesh, Adv.
 Mr. Abhishek Aggarwal, Adv.

Mr. Vimal Chandra S. Dave, Adv.
 Ms. Neelam Kalsi, Adv.

Mr. Shashi Bhushan Kumar, Adv.

Ms. Shalu sharma, Adv.

Mr. Debasis Misra, Adv. (NP)

Mr. Ugra Shankar Prasad, Adv.

Mr. Devashish Bharuka, Adv.

Mr. Ravindra Bana, Adv.

Mr. Sunil Fernandes, Adv.

Mr. Arun Monga, Adv.
Mr. Aviral Dhirendra, Adv
Ms. Sunita Sharma, Adv.
Mr. D.K. Monga, Adv.

Mr. Prakash Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. Fakhruddin, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Rajkishore Choudhary, Adv.
Mr. T. Mahipal, Adv.

Ms. Kawaljit Kochar, Adv.
Ms. Kusum Chaudhary, Adv.

Mr. Mohan Prasad Gupta, Adv.
For Mr. D.S. Mahra, Adv.
For Ms. Sushma Suri, Adv.

Mr. Subrat Birla, Adv.
Mr. Subhash Chandra Birla, Adv.

Mr. Gaurav M. Librehan, Adv.
Ms. Mukti Chowdhary, Adv.

Mr. B.S. Banthia, Adv. (NP)

Mr. C.D. Singh, Adv.

Mr. Nidhesh Gupta, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Tarun Gupta, Adv.
For Ms. S. Janani, Adv.

Mr. Manoj Swarup, Adv.
Ms. Neha Kedia, Adv.
Mr. Ajay Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Akhil Sibal, Adv.
Mr. Deepak Khurana, Adv.
Ms. Aditi Sfharma, Adv.
Mr. Umesh Kumar Khaitan, Adv.

Ms. Anubha Agrawal, Adv.

Mr. Ashok Mathur, Adv.

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

C.A.NOS.286/2012, 354-364/2012, 389-397/2012:

The Civil Appeals are disposed of, in terms of the signed order.

C.A.Nos.311/2012,687/2011, 689/2011, 672-673/2011, 695-696/2011, 697-698/2011, 833/2011, 668/2011,573/2011, 582-582/2011, 701/2011, 877-879/2011, 685-686/2011, 581/2011, 881/2011 and 652/2011:

The Civil Appeals are disposed of, in terms of the signed order.

C.A.Nos.885/2011, 889/2011, 27743/2010,314/2012,671/2012, 384/2012, 381/2012, 790-791/2012, 829/2011, S.L.P. (C)Nos.1088/2011, 31147/2010, 25510/2010, 4993/2010:

De-tag and list separately.

S.L.P.(C)Nos.22171-22712/2011, 28096-28098/2011, 27306-27308/2011 and 22657/2011:

De-tag and list separately.

C.A.Nos.830/2011, 886/2011, 875-876/2011, 313/2012, 832/2011, 888/2011, 886/2011, 1006/2011, 1014/2011, 989/2011, 1009/2011, 1015/2011, 700/2011, 992/2011, 990/2011, 1017/2011, 887/2011, 654/2011, 653/2011, 828/2011 and S.L.P.(C)No.1628/2011,14408/2011:

De-tag and list separately.

C.A.Nos.577/2011, 688/2011, 835/2011:

De-tag and list separately.

S.L.P.(C)No.5622/2011, 5618/2011, 5624/2011, 5626/2011, 5649/2011 and C.A.No.834/2011:

De-tag and list separately.

(G.V.Ramana)
Court Master

(19 Signed orders are placed on the file)

(Vinod Kulvi)
Asstt.Registrar