SUPREME COURT OF INDIA RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 3681-3682/2021

(Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 18-02-2021 in CWP No. 11539/2020 18-02-2021 in CWP No. 11688/2020 passed by the High Court Of Punjab & Haryana At Chandigarh)

GURJEET SINGH JOHAR & ANR.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 93377/2021 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION IA No. 29753/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 142711/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.
IA No. 32455/2021 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

IA No. 29755/2021 - PERMISSION TO FILE LENGTHY LIST OF DATES)

WITH

SLP(C) No. 3797/2021 (IV-B) (IA No. 93385/2021 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION IA No. 30944/2021 - PERMISSION TO FILE LENGTHY LIST OF DATES)

SLP(C) No. 7230/2021 (XVII-A) (IA No. 61920/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Date: 18-04-2023 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HRISHIKESH ROY HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ MISRA

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Sahil Bhalaik, AOR

Mr. Abhimanyu Bhandari, Adv. Ms. Rooh-e-hina Dua, AOR Mr. Sangram S. Saron, Adv. Mr. Harshit Khanduja, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. A. Lakshminarayanan, AOR

Mr. Lakshmi Kantham, Adv.

Ms. Shilpa Gamnani, Adv.

Ms. Liz Mathew, AOR

Mr. Amrish Kumar, AOR

Mr. K.m Nataraj, A.S.G. Mr. Shailesh Madiyal, Adv.

Mr. Nachiketa Joshi, Adv.

Mrs. Preeti Rani, Adv.

Mr. Saurav Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Abhishek Arora, Adv.

Mr. Ronak Karanpuria, AOR

Mr. Anmol Amit Srivastav, Adv.

Mr. Parteek Kumar, Adv.

Mr. M.L. Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Rajat Sharma, Adv.

Ms. Meenakshi Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Sushil K. Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Surender Kumar Jain, Adv.

Mr. Subhasish Bhowmick, AOR

Mr. Kundan Kumar Mishra, AOR

Mr. Jitendra Kumar, Adv.

Mr. H.K. Monga, Adv.

Mr. Mohit Monga, Adv.

Ms. Megha Gaur, Adv.

Mr. Vibhav Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Ekansh Bansal, Adv.

Mr. Parmanand Gaur, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

ORDER

Learned counsel for the petitioners prays for time to file additional document and bring on record the subsequent developments.

On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondents submits that these matters have practically become infructuous. Moreover, the petitioners should have availed alternate remedy under Section 27A of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986, before the National Consumer Dispute Resolution Commission.

The matters be relisted accordingly after four weeks.

(NITIN TALREJA)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(MALEKAR NAGARAJ) BRANCH OFFICER