

ITEM NO.23

COURT NO.12

SECTION IX

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

I.A. 31-42/2015, I.A. 43-54/2015, I.A. 55-66/2015, I.A. 67-78/2015,
I.A. 79-90/2015 in Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C)
Nos. 13140-13151/2015

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 09/05/2014
in WP No. 8985/2011, in WP No. 132/2012, in WP No. 3934/2013, in ST
No. 29201/2014, in ST No. 29210/2014, in WP No. 135/2012, in WP No.
8909/2011, in ST No. 29199/2014, in ST No. 29215/2014, in ST No.
29206/2014, in WP No. 8734/2011, in ST No. 29219/2014 passed by the
High Court of Bombay at Aurangabad)

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA
AND ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

SAVITRI NARSAYYA GUDDAPA
ETC. ETC.

Respondent(s)

(For impleadment)

Date : 26/10/2015 These applications were called on for hearing
today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.K. AGRAWAL
[IN CHAMBERS]

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Prashant Kenjale, Adv.
Mr. Nishant Ramakantrao Katneshwarkar, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Anshuman, Adv.
Mr. A. Radhakrishnan, Adv.

Mr. Brij Kishor Sha, Adv.
Mr. S. M. Jadhav, Adv. for
M/s. S. M. Jadhav & Company

Mr. Shashibhushan P. Adgaonkar, Adv.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally signed by
Sarita Purohit
Date: 2015.10.31

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

18:27:21 IST
Reason:

I.A. Nos. 43-54 of 2015, 55-66 of 2015, 67-78 of 2015
2

and 79-90 of 2015

Learned counsel for the petitioners has no objection
to the applicants being impleaded.

Learned counsel for the applicants submits that they
were the parties in Writ Petition before the High Court and
the High Court disposed of the Writ Petition. Therefore,

they have to protect their right. The applications for impleadment are allowed.

Amended cause title be filed within four weeks from today.

I.A. No. 31 to 42 of 2015

Even though the applicant was not a party in the Writ Petition before the High Court but the similarly placed persons are party before this Court as respondents.

Instead of permitting the applicant to be impleaded, it will be appropriate in the interest of the justice that the applicant be permitted to intervene.

I.A. Nos. 31 to 42 are accordingly, disposed of.

[RASHI GUPTA]
SR.P.A.

[RAJINDER KAUR]
COURT MASTER

à

1

ITEM NO.23

COURT NO.12

SECTION IX

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

I.A. 31-42/2015, I.A. 43-54/2015, I.A. 55-66/2015, I.A. 67-78/2015, I.A. 79-90/2015 in Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) Nos. 13140-13151/2015

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 09/05/2014 in WP No. 8985/2011, in WP No. 132/2012, in WP No. 3934/2013, in ST No. 29201/2014, in ST No. 29210/2014, in WP No. 135/2012, in WP No. 8909/2011, in ST No. 29199/2014, in ST No. 29215/2014, in ST No. 29206/2014, in WP No. 8734/2011, in ST No. 29219/2014 passed by the High Court of Bombay at Aurangabad)

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA
AND ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

SAVITRI NARSAYYA GUDDAPA
ETC. ETC.

Respondent(s)

(For impleadment)

Date : 26/10/2015 These applications were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.K. AGRAWAL
[IN CHAMBERS]

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Prashant Kenjale, Adv.
Mr. Nishant Ramakantrao Katneshwarkar, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Anshuman, Adv.
Mr. A. Radhakrishnan, Adv.

Mr. Brij Kishor Sha, Adv.
Mr. S. M. Jadhav, Adv. for
M/s. S. M. Jadhav & Company

Mr. Shashibhushan P. Adgaonkar, Adv.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally signed by
Sarita Purohit

Date: 2015.10.31

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

18:27:21 IST

Reason:

I.A. Nos. 43-54 of 2015, 55-66 of 2015, 67-78 of 2015
2

and 79-90 of 2015

Learned counsel for the petitioners has no objection to the applicants being impleaded.

Learned counsel for the applicants submits that they were the parties in Writ Petition before the High Court and the High Court disposed of the Writ Petition. Therefore, they have to protect their right. The applications for impleadment are allowed.

Amended cause title be filed within four weeks from today.

I.A. No. 31 to 42 of 2015

Even though the applicant was not a party in the Writ Petition before the High Court but the similarly placed persons are party before this Court as respondents.

Instead of permitting the applicant to be impleaded, it will be appropriate in the interest of the justice that the applicant be permitted to intervene.

I.A. Nos. 31 to 42 are accordingly, disposed of.

[RASHI GUPTA]
SR.P.A.

[RAJINDER KAUR]
COURT MASTER