

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

BEFORE THE REGISTRAR S.G. SHAH

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl) No(s).3520/2010

RAVINDRA PAL SINGH

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

AJIT SINGH & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for cancellation of bail)

WITH

T.P.(CRL) NO. 222 of 2010
(With office report)
SLP(Crl) NO. 3521 of 2010
(With office report)
SLP(Crl) NO. 3522 of 2010
(With office report)
SLP(Crl) NO. 3523 of 2010
(With office report)
SLP(Crl) NO. 3527 of 2010
(With office report)
SLP(Crl) NO. 3529 of 2010
(With office report)
SLP(Crl) NO. 3573 of 2010
(With office report)

Date: 04/08/2010 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

For Petitioner(s)

Mr A.T.Rao,Adv.
Mr. A. Subba Rao,Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr Rajat Khattry, Adv.
Mr. Subramonium Prasad,Adv.
Mr Aslam Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma ,Adv

-2-

Item No.61

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

Today, the learned Advocate, Mr Rajat Khattry appearing

on behalf of Mr Subramonium Prasad states that the Advocate appearing for Mr Subramonium Prasad on 19.7.2010 has not properly disclosed before the Court that whether they are accepting notice for all the respondents or whether they are accepting notice for some of the respondents only.

It is unfortunate state of affairs that all the Advocates appearing before this Court are mentioning their name in mentioning slip though only one advocate is appearing. They are not disclosing the correct fact when matters are called out and when orders are dictated in their presence.

Now Mr Rajat Khattry has today given a list of SLPs in his appearance slip disclosing that they are appearing for respondent No.1 in SLP(Crl.) nos. 3520, 3522, 3527, 3521, 3523, 3529, 3573 of 2010 and since all these respondents are also litigant in TP(Crl.) no. 222/2010 , they accept notice for only those seven persons in connected SLP and transfer petition and not for all the respondents in all matters.

In view of the above facts, petitioner has to confirm service on remaining unserved respondents in TP(Crl.) no. 222/2010. For the purpose, the learned Advocate for the petitioner requests that they may be permitted to serve dasti notice through the nearest Civil Court/Trial Court, since it is difficult for them to locate the respondents who are avoiding service intentionally.

-3-

Item No.61

Dasti service is already allowed and issued as per Court's order dated 19.4.2010.

It is again permitted to be served through the nearest Civil Court/Trial Court .

Such Courts are specifically directed to confirm service either through the process server or through the Investigating Agency or even by affixing the same at the given address, if it could not be served in due course.

Trial Court is further informed that if any of the

unserved respondents is not available at his recorded address,

they they should take appropriate steps against such respondent as well the surety, accepted while granting bail.

Served respondents may file counter affidavit before the next date.

List again on 31.8.2010.

(S.G. SHAH)
Registrar

hj