

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).6456/2012

(From the judgement and order dated 20/01/2012 in FAO No.7/2011 of
The HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT N. DELHI)

ALLOYS WOBLEN

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

YOGESH MEHRA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for exemption from filing c/c of the impugned
Judgment and prayer for interim relief and office report))

WITH SLP(C) NO. 9152-9155 of 2012

(With appln.(s) for exemption from filing C/C of the impugned
judgment and permission to place addl. documents on record and with
prayer for interim relief and office report)

Date: 16/03/2012 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AFTAB ALAM

HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RANJANA PRAKASH DESAI

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr.Adv.
Mr. Sudhir Chandra, Sr.Adv.
Mr. Pravin Anand, Adv.
Mr. Hari Shankar K,Adv.
Ms. Binny Kalra, Adv.
Mr. Shrawan Chopra, Adv.
Mr. Vikas Singh Jangra, Adv.
Ms. Soukshmya, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Soli Sorabjee, Sr.Adv.
Mr. Arvind Datar, Sr.Adv.
Mr. R. Parthasarthy, Adv.
Mr. Ayush Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Sudarshan Singh, Adv.
Mr.M.P.Devanath,Adv.

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

S.L.P.(C) No. 6456 of 2012

Issue notice.

Mr. M.P. Devanath, learned counsel accepts notice
on behalf of Respondent Nos. 1 to 3.

-2-

As prayed by Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, learned senior
counsel, notice need not go to Respondent Nos. 4 to 6.

S.L.P.(C) No.9152-9155 of 2012

These special leave petitions have been filed
against an interim order passed by the Madras High Court
by which, the High Court vacated an order of status quo

earlier passed by it. We are not inclined to entertain these special leave petitions, primarily, because the order under challenge is only an interim order. The special leave petitions are dismissed.

However, having regard to the nature of the controversy, we deem it proper to request the Madras High Court to dispose of all the Writ Petitions of the petitioners filed before it challenging the revocation order(s) passed by the Intellectual Property Appellate Board (IPAB) at an early date and preferably, within eight weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this Order.

Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioners expressed the apprehension that the High Court, while finally hearing the writ petitions might be influenced by certain observations made in the impugned order against which these special leave petitions have been filed. In our view, the misconceived. While hearing the Writ Petitions finally the High Court will not be constrained by any observations made at the interim stage.

(Sukhbir Paul Kaur) (Sneh Bala Mehra)
Court Master Court Master

Court Master Court Master

Court Master Court Master