

ITEM NO.36+13 Court 3 (Video Conferencing)

SECTION PIL-W

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

Writ Petition(s) (Civil) No(s). 880/2020

DR. JOE JOSEPH &amp; ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF TAMIL NADU &amp; ORS.

Respondent(s)

([ FOR PHYSICAL HEARING ON 22.11.2021 ]

IA No. 34931/2021 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION

IA No. 115585/2020 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION

IA No. 79129/2020 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS)

WITH

SLP(C) No. 3924/2021 (XI-A)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.32597/2021-EXEMPTION FROM FILING  
C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

W.P.(C) No. 771/2021 (PIL-W)

(FOR ADMISSION .)

W.P.(C) No. 1225 of 2021

Date : 22-11-2021 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.M. KHANWILKAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.T. RAVIKUMAR

For parties:

Dr. S. Gopakumaran Nair, Adv.  
Mr. T. G. Narayanan Nair, AOR  
Mr. Sooraj T. Elanjickal, Adv.  
Ms. Priya Balakrishnan, Adv.  
Mr. Aswin Kumar M.J., Adv.

Mr. Wills Mathews, adv.  
Mr. D.K. Tiwari, Adv.  
Mr. rakesh Garg, Adv.  
Mr. Ashish Gopal Garg, Adv.  
Mr. Anil Kr. Shukla, Adv.  
Mr. Mathen Joseph, Adv.  
Ms. Shweta Garg, AOR

Mr. Jaideep Gupta, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. G. Prakash, AOR  
Ms. Priyanka Prakash, Adv.  
Ms. Beena Prakash, Adv.  
Mr. Manan Sanghai, Adv.

Mr. V. K. Biju, AOR

Ms. Ria Sachthey, Adv.  
 Mr. Chetanya Singh, Adv.  
 Mr. Amlendu Kumar Akhilesh Kumar Jha, Adv.  
 Mr. Parthsarthi M. Saraf, Adv.  
 Mr. Abhay Pratap Singh, Adv.  
 Ms. Vijay Laxmi, Adv.

Mr. Tushar Mehta, SG  
 Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, ASG  
 Mr. Sanjay Jain, ASG  
 Mr. Rajat Nair, Adv.  
 Ms. Shradha Deshmukh, Adv.  
 Ms. Vanshja Shukla, Adv.  
 Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, AOR

Mr. Shekhar Naphade, Sr. Adv.  
 Mr. V. Krishnamurthy, Sr. Adv.  
 Mr. N.R. Elango, sr. Adv.  
 Mr. G. Umapathy, Adv.  
 Mr. D.kumanan, AOR  
 Mr. Aishwarya Dash, Adv.

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

Heard learned counsel for the concerned parties.

In all fairness, it is submitted that no immediate direction is sought at this stage. Instead, it is urged that the main matter itself be proceeded expeditiously.

We have no difficulty in acceding to the request to expeditiously dispose of the main proceedings.

The W.P.(C) No. 880 of 2020 can proceed soon after the hearing of part-heard matters (Diary No(s). 34207/2018 and connected matters and SLP(Crl.) No. 4634 of 2014 and connected matters) is concluded.

For the time being, we direct the listing of all

these cases on 10.12.2021 for directions only.

In the event, hearing of part-heard matters is concluded early, the registry may fix these matters for direction even before 10.12.2021.

As regards SLP(C) No. 3924 of 2021, the issues raised in those proceedings are overlapping with the issues raised in W.P.(C) No. 880 of 2020.

It is agreed by the learned counsel for the petitioner that formal notice need not be issued in the present special leave petition but the petitioner be permitted to raise all contentions in the main matter. The respondents in the said case, however, are at liberty to file affidavit in reference to any specific issue that they propose to counter on facts, before the next date.

As regards W.P.(C) No. 771 of 2021, it is fairly agreed by the learned counsel for the petitioner that formal notice need not be issued. It is further stated that advance copy of the petition has already been served on the concerned respondents. Even in this petition, if the respondents wish to file any reply affidavit to specifically counter any specific fact(s), they are free to do so before the next date of hearing.

As regards W.P.(C) No. 1225 of 2021, even in this

writ petition, more or less, overlapping issues are involved as raised in the leading writ petition. The petitioner, however, wants to highlight certain other aspects which the petitioner can raise at the time of hearing.

The respondents, if so advised, may file response to the additional issues raised in this writ petition before the next date of hearing.

In all the writ petitions, learned counsel for the petitioners agree that formal notice need not be issued as advance copy has already been served.

This procedure would obviate any further delay in the hearing of these cases.

Interim order, if any, to continue till the next date of hearing.

(DEEPAK SINGH)  
COURT MASTER (SH)

(VIDYA NEGI)  
COURT MASTER (NSH)