

15.1.1988 [Per BCG]

Order copy dt 15/1/88
served on R. no. 2
on 21/1/88 &
Applicant on nil.

29/1/88 -

Order copy dt 15/1/88
served on R. no. 1
on 8/2/88

16/2/88

Heard Mr. Gangal for the applicant
in order to decide whether the
matter is to be decided. In our
opinion the application deserves to be
summarily rejected for the following
reasons:-

The applicant has filed
Original Application No: 123/87.
claiming similar reliefs. That
application was dismissed. Not only
that, Review Petition No: 10/87 that was
filed was also dismissed. It cannot
be disputed that the reliefs that were
claimed in the earlier proceedings
and the reliefs claimed in this
proceedings are the same. Mr. Gangal
~~contended~~ contended that he ~~has~~
relies upon the judgment of
the Allahabad High Court and
the said judgment was not
then available for being
submitted at the time when
Original Application No: 123/87

Cont

(2)

was dismissed. In our opinion
this cannot be a ground for
entertaining a fresh application

The application is therefore,
summarily dismissed.

B. C. Gadgil
(B. C. GADGIL)
V.C.

Order dtd. 30-7-90 Passed
by Supreme Court served
to Respondent No. 1, & 2
dtd. 28/9/90.

Order dtd 30.7.90
served on Applicant
dtd on 31.9.90

P. Srinivasan
(P. SRINIVASAN)
MEMBER (A)
15/1/88