

Both sides present. Xk

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.

17.12.91.

NVK & ND

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

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.

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.

4.2.92

31/1

counter filed in
DA 814/90 to be
accepted for this
case also. listed
for F.H. on 4.2.92

[Handwritten signature/initials]

[Handwritten signature/initials]

[Handwritten signature/initials]

27-2.92

SPM DAVH

Mr. Rajendran Hair/Mr. Ramakumar through proxy
SCCSC through proxy/Ajith Narayanan/CCSC

Heard. M.P. allowed. Counter affidavit

mentioned therein will be relevant for this case also.

Heard in Part. List for further hearing on 28.2.92(AN).

27.2.92

28.2.92 (counsel as above)

SP DAVH

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 applications and condone the delay if there has been in any one of them. In certain cases we are told that representations 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-submission of representation is also overruled.

JUDGMENT on 31.3.92.

(AVH)

28.2.92

21.4.92

SPM & DAVH

Orders pronounced in open court.

21.4.92