

AVK & AVIT

(12)

Mr VRL Nam

Mr V Ajit Amegam by Proxy

The learned Counsel for the respondents submits that a batch of connected Case (CA 814/90) is fixed for final hearing on 24/4/92. He also submits that in this Case also, he has filed an M.P. to adopt the reply filed in CA

814/90 in this Case also. The learned Counsel for the applicant admits that copy of this M.P. has already been served on the Respondents.

In the circumstances, let the matter be listed before the Bench on 24/4/92. After CA-814/90 and the M.P. stated to have been filed by the respondents.

Call on 24/4/92

15/4/92

27.2.92

SPRINT

Mr. Rajonaras Balz/Ramkumar th. proxy
Sugunapalan th. proxy/Ajith Narayanan

28.2.92 allowed. Counteraffidavit
mentioned therein will be relevant for this case
also. Heard in part. List for further hearing on
29.2. (AM).

27.2.92

28.2.92 (counsel as above)

We have heard the arguments of the learned
counsel for both the parties. In the interest of justice
and considering that a vital question in all these
cases are involved we have admitted all the applica-
tions and condone the delay if there has been in any
one of them. In certain cases we are told that re-
presentations are not been filed. Considering that
the issues involved are identical we need not delay
the matters in this application by going through the
formality of requiring applicants to file a representation
especially when identical applications are pending
before us.

Accordingly the objection regarding non-
submission of representation is also overruled.

AMH

JUDGMENT ON 31.1.92.

23.2.92

(2)

MR. TAVIT

Mr. V.R. Rami

Mr. V. Ajit Raman by Proxy

The learned Counsel for the respondents submits that a batch of connected cases (OA 814/90) is fixed for final hearing on 24/2/92. He also submits that in this case ~~also~~ he has filed a M.P. to adopt the reply filed in OA 814/90 in this case also. The learned Counsel for the applicant admits that copy of that M.P. has already been served on the respondents.

In the circumstances, let the matter be listed before the Bench on 24/2/92. After OA- 814/90 and the M.P. stated to have been filed by the respondents.

Call on 24/2/92



13/2/92

7/10/92

27.2.92

APPROVAL

Mr. Rajan: ran Sair/Amankumar th. proxy
Suganpolan th. proxy/Ajith Sanyanam

Here, H.P. allowed. Counteraffidavit
mentioned therein will be relevant for this case
also. Fixed in part. List for further hearing on
28.2.92.

27.2.92

28.2.92

(Council as above)

We have heard the arguments of the learned
counsel for both the parties. In the interest of justice
and considering that a vital question in all these
cases are involved we have admitted all the applica-
tions and condone the delay if there has been in any
one of them. In certain cases we are told that re-
presentations are not been filed. Considering that
the issues involved are identical we need not delay
the matters in this application by going through the
formality of requiring applicants to file a representation
especially when identical applications are pending
before us.

Accordingly the objection regarding non-
submission of representation is also overruled.

ADJUDICATE ON 31.3.92.

23.2.92

21-4-92

SPM + DVH

Orders pronounced in open court

21.4.92