

Both sides present.

Counsel for respondents submits that a joint counter affidavit will be filed in all these cases within 3 weeks. Counsel for applicant may file rejoinder within one week. Call on 31.1.92.

SK
17.12.91.

NVK & ND

(25) Mr MJ Nedumpara- Petitioner/Respondent
Mr K Ramakumar - Respondent/Applicant.

31/1
Respondents have filed MP 160/92 seeking to adopt the reply statement filed in DA No.814/90, copy of which is enclosed with this DA, as the reply to this DA also. The learned counsel for the respondents submits that DA 814/90 is fixed for final hearing on 4.2.92. In the circumstance, let this DA ~~may~~ also be listed for final hearing alongwith that DA.

Rejoinder, if any, should be filed well before that date. Call on 4.2.92.

b/0
27.1.92

4.2.92

SPM&AVH

Mr.Rajendran Nair/Mr.Ramachandran Nair
Mr.NN Sugunapalan-SCGSC

The learned counsel for the respondents Shri NN Sugunapalan has filed a statement that in 30 identical cases the counter affidavit has been filed and those may be heard along with these cases together. The learned counsel for the applicant wishes to file rejoinder. The learned counsel in any of these cases are at liberty to file rejoinder if so desire within one week with a copy to the learned counsel for the respondents.

List for final hearing along with 30 cases mentioned by respondents in M.P. on 24.2.1992 afternoon.

✓ SJ
4.2.92

27-2-92

SPIN&DNH

286

Mr. Rajendran Setty/mr. Balakumar through proxy
SSOC through proxy/Ajith Karayanan AGSSC

get to file. The MCA 1956 will be given to the parties

Rehd. M.P. allowed. Counter affidavit
mentioned therein will be relevant for this case also.
Rehd in Part. List for further hearing on 28.2.92 (AS).

R. S.

27.2.92

28.2.92 (counsel as above) SPIN&DNH

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 to have admitted all the application
and condone the delay if there has been in any one
of them. In certain cases we are told that repre-
sentations are not been filed. Considering that the
issues involved are identical we need not delay the
matters in this applications by going through the
formality of requiring applicants to file representation especially
when identical applications are pending before us.

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

REHEARING on 21.3.92

(AS)

21.4.92 SPIN&DNH

Orders pronounced in open court

21.4.92

Order of the Court pronounced in open court

5.5.92

Order of the Court pronounced in open court

6.5.92

Order of the Court pronounced in open court

7.5.92

Order of the Court pronounced in open court

8.5.92

Order of the Court pronounced in open court

9.5.92

Order of the Court pronounced in open court

10.5.92