

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.974 OF 2012

MADHYA PRADESH RURAL ROAD
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & ANR.

APPELLANTS

VERSUS

M/S. L.G. CHAUDHARY ENGINEERS AND CONTRACTORS

RESPONDENT

WITH

SLP(C) No. 15059/2011

CIVIL APPEAL NO.2615 OF 2018

(Arising out of SLP(C) No. 16889/2012)

CIVIL APPEAL NO.2751 OF 2018

(Arising out of SLP(C) No. 11615/2012)

CIVIL APPEAL NO.2753 OF 2018

(Arising out of SLP(C) No. 11617/2012)

CIVIL APPEAL NO.2754 OF 2018

(Arising out of SLP(C) No. 11618/2012)

CIVIL APPEAL NO.2755 OF 2018

(Arising out of SLP(C) No. 11619/2012)

CIVIL APPEAL NO.2616 OF 2018

(Arising out of SLP(C) No. 35641/2011)

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.2756-2757 OF 2018

(Arising out of SLP(C) Nos. 11633-11634/2012)

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.2758-2759 OF 2018

(Arising out of SLP(C) Nos. 11631-11632/2012)

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.2760-2761 OF 2018

(Arising out of SLP(C) Nos. 11628-11629/2012)

CIVIL APPEAL NO.2762 OF 2018

(Arising out of SLP(C) No. 796 of 2014)

SLP(C) No. 12478/2016

SLP(C) No. 19637/2017

SLP(C) No. 21017/2017

SLP(C) No. 7416/2017

SLP(C) No. 21037/2017

SLP(C) No. 30773/2017

SLP(C) No. 23107/2017

SLP(C) No. 7407/2017

SLP(C) No. 5076/2017

SLP(C) No. 20744/2017

SLP(C) No. 17070/2017

SLP(C) No. 18212/2017

SLP(C) No. 25319/2017

SLP(C) No. 25321/2017

SLP(C) No. 21434/2017

Diary No(s). 23682/2017

Diary No(s). 23685/2017

C.A. No. 11383/2017

SLP(C) Nos. 1635-1637/2018

SLP(C) Nos. 1631-1633/2018

O R D E R

C.A. No.974/2012:

The matter has been placed before this Bench of three Judges pursuant to order dated 24th January, 2012 which is as follows :

“In view of some divergence of views expressed in the two judgments delivered today by us, the matter may be placed before Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India for constituting a larger Bench to resolve the divergence.”

Appointment of arbitrator in a dispute arising out of execution of a 'works contract' was the subject-matter for consideration before the High Court under Section 11 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.

Appellants raised objection that the matter being covered by a special State Act, namely, M.P. Madhyastham Adhikaran Adhiniyam, 1983 ("M.P. Act", in short), the application under Section 11 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 could not be entertained. The High Court, however, overruled the said objection relying upon the judgment of this Court in Va Tech Escher Wyass Flovel Ltd. v. MPSE Board & Another, (2011) 13 SCC 261.

When the matter was considered by a Bench of this Court on 24th January, 2012 (order reported in Madhya Pradesh Rural Road Development Authority and Anr. v. L.G. Chaudhary Engineers and Contractors, (2012) 3 SCC 495), this Court held that the judgment in Va Tech Escher Wyass Flovel Ltd. (supra) was *per incuriam* insofar as it held that the M.P. Act stands implied repealed by the Central Act. While Hon'ble Ganguly J., held that the State Act will cover a dispute even after termination of the 'works contract', Hon'ble Gyan Sudha Mishra J. took a different view as follows:

"51. It is no doubt true that if the matter were before an Arbitrator appointed under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 for adjudication of any dispute including the question regarding the justification and legality as to whether the cancellation of works contract was legal or illegal, then the said Arbitrator in view of the ratio of the

judgment of the Supreme Court in Maharshi Dayanand University & Anr. Vs. Anand Co-op L(C) Society, (2007) 5 SCC 295, as also in view of the persuasive reasoning assigned in the judgment and order reported in Heyman & Anr. Vs. Darwins, Limited, (1942) 1 All E.R. 337 (HL), would have had the jurisdiction to adjudicate the dispute regarding the justification and legality of cancellation of works contract also. But the same cannot be allowed to be raised under the M.P. Act of 1983 since the definition of 'works contract' unambiguously lays down in explicit terms as to what is the nature and scope of 'works contract' and further enumerates the specific nature of disputes arising out of the execution of works contract which would come within the definition of a 'works contract'. However, the same does not even vaguely include the issue or dispute arising out of cancellation and termination of contract due to which this question, in my considered opinion, would not fall within the jurisdiction of the M.P. State Arbitration Tribunal so as to be referred for adjudication arising out of its termination."

We find from the definition under Section 2(d) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 that even after a contract is terminated, the subject-matter of dispute is covered by the said definition. The said provision has not been even referred to in the judgment rendered by Hon'ble Gyan Sudha Mishra, J.

In view of above, we are of the opinion that the view expressed by Hon'ble Ganguly J. is the correct interpretation and not the contra view of Hon'ble Gyan Sudha Mishra J. Reference stands answered accordingly.

Taking up appeal on merits, we find that the High Court proceeded on the basis of the judgment of this Court in Va

Tech Escher Wyass Flovel Ltd. (supra) which has been held to be *per incuriam*. The M.P. Act cannot be held to be impliedly repealed.

We are, thus, in agreement with the proposed opinion of Hon'ble Ganguly J. in para 42 of the reported judgment which reads as follows:

"42. Therefore, appeal is allowed and the judgment of the High Court which is based on the reasoning of *Va Tech Escher Wyass Flovel Ltd. V. M.P. SEB, Misc. Appeal No.380 of 2003, order dated 5-3-2003 (MP)* is set aside. This Court holds the decision in *Va Tech Escher Wyass Flovel Ltd. v. M.P. SEB, (2011) 13 SCC 261* has been rendered in *per incuriam*. In that view of the matter the arbitration proceeding may proceed under M.P. Act of 1983 and not under the A.C. Act 1996."

The appeal is accordingly disposed of.

C.A. No.2615 of 2018 @ SLP(C) No.16889/2012:

Leave granted.

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Proceedings under the M.P. Madhyastham Adhikaran Adhiniyam, 1983 (the State Act) were pending before the M.P. Arbitration Tribunal at Bhopal. The respondent raised an objection that in view *Va Tech Escher Wyass Flovel Ltd. V. MPSE Board & Another 2011 (13) SCC 261*, the Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1966 Act will apply and the State Act will not apply. This objection was rejected. The respondent preferred a writ petition. The High Court has upheld the objection and quashed the proceedings under the State Act.

Learned counsel for the State has drawn our attention to

Section 2(4) of the Central Act which is as follows:

"This part except sub-section (1) of Section 40, Sections 41 and 43 shall apply to every arbitration under any other enactment for the time being in force, as if the arbitration were pursuant to an arbitration agreement and as if that other enactment were an arbitration agreement, except in so far as the provisions of this Part are inconsistent with that other enactment or with any rules made thereunder."

It was pointed out that the above provision was in *pari materia* with Section 46 of the Arbitration Act, 1940 which was interpreted by this Court in *Dhanrajamal Gobindram v. Shamji Kalidas & Co. (1961) 3 SCR 1020 : AIR 1961 SC 1285*. This Court held:-

"Section 46 makes the provisions of any other enactment or any rules made thereunder to prevail over the Arbitration Act, if inconsistent with the latter. In view of these several provisions, it is clear that the Arbitration Act applies to all Arbitrations and Chap. II makes it applicable also to arbitrations, in which the arbitration agreement is asked to be filed in Court under Section 20 subject, however, to this that the provisions of any other enactment or rules made thereunder, if inconsistent with the Arbitration Act, are to prevail."

The same view was taken in *Punjab State Electricity Board, Mahilpur v. Guru Nanak Cold Storage & ICE Factory, Mahilpur and Another (1996) 5 SCC 411* in para 12 which is as follows:

"Sections 6(1), 7, 12, 36 and 37 have expressly excluded from the operation of statutory arbitration. The rest of the provisions per force would get attracted. But the provisions of the appropriate statute or rules should necessarily be consistent with the provisions of the Arbitration Act. In that event,

despite absence of an arbitration agreement, rest of the provisions of Arbitration Act would apply (as if there was an arbitration agreement between the parties) and the dispute becomes arbitrable under the Arbitration Act, as if there was an arbitration agreement between the parties. If there is any inconsistency, then the provisions of the Arbitration Act do not get attracted. Section 33 expressly gives power to the civil court to decide the existence or validity of the arbitration agreement or the award as such. If this question was to arise, necessarily the civil court would be devoid of jurisdiction to decide the dispute on merits but only in the forum of arbitration. The existence and validity of the arbitration agreement should be decided by the civil court. The arbitrator cannot clothe himself with jurisdiction to conclusively decide it by himself as a jurisdictional issue. It is for the court to decide it. The dispute on merits should be resolved by the arbitrator and the legality of the award would be subject to decision by the court under Section 33".

In view of above, we are of the view that the State law will prevail in terms of Section 2(4) of the Central Act. The reference under the State law was valid and could be decided in accordance with the State.

Accordingly, we set aside the impugned order and restore the proceedings before the Tribunal.

The appeal is, accordingly, allowed in above terms.

C.A. No.2751 of 2018 @ SLP(C) No. 11615/2012, C.A. No.2753 of 2018 @ SLP(C) No. 11617/2012, C.A. No.2754 of 2018 @ SLP(C) No.11618/2012, C.A. No.2755 of 2018 @ SLP(C) No. 11619/2012, C.A. Nos.2756-2757 of 2018 @ SLP(C) Nos. 11633-11634/2012, C.A. Nos.2758-2759 of 2018 @ SLP(C) Nos. 11631-11632/2012 & C.A. Nos.2760-2761 of 2018 @ SLP(C) No. 11628-11629/2012:

Leave granted.

In view of order passed in Civil Appeal No.2615 of 2018 (@

SLP(C)NO.16889 of 2012), the impugned order is set aside and the application(s) filed by the respondent(s) under Section 11 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996 are dismissed.

However, since it is stated that proceedings are pending before the Arbitrator in pursuance of the impugned order, the same will stand transferred to the State Tribunal and the State Tribunal may proceed further taking into account the proceedings which have already been taken. Learned counsel for the respondent(s) pointed out that in view of Section 16(2), the objection to the jurisdiction could not be raised after statement of defence was filed. This contention cannot be accepted in view of the fact that the SLP was filed prior to the filing of statement of defence wherein this objection was raised.

We do not express any opinion on the applicability of the State Act where award has already been made. In such cases if no objection to the jurisdiction of the arbitration was taken at relevant stage, the award may not be annulled only on that ground.

The appeals are, accordingly, disposed of.

C.A. No.2616 @ SLP(C) No. 35641/2011:

Leave granted.

In view of order passed in C.A. No.2751 of 2018 @ SLP(C) No.16615/2012, no objection having been raised by the respondents in terms of Section 16(2) of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 at appropriate stage within the time stipulated, the award could not have been annulled.

Accordingly, this appeal is allowed, the impugned judgment is

set aside and the award is restored.

It is, however make it clear that this order will not debar proceedings under Section 34 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.

C.A. No.2762 of 2018 @ SLP(C) No. 796/2014:

Leave granted.

In view of order passed in C.A. No.2616 of 2018 @ SLP(C) No.35641/2011, the impugned order is set aside and the matter is remanded to the High Court for fresh decision under the Madhya Pradesh Madhyastham Adhikaran Adhiniyam, 1983, in accordance with law.

The appeal is disposed of in above terms.

Pending applications, if any, are also stand disposed of.

SLP(C) No. 19637/2017, SLP(C) No. 21017/2017, SLP(C) No. 7416/2017, SLP(C) No. 21037/2017, SLP(C) No. 30773/2017, SLP(C) No. 23107/2017, SLP(C) No. 7407/2017, SLP(C) No. 5076/2017 & SLP(C) No. 20744/2017:

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

We do not find any ground to interfere with the impugned order. The special leave petitions are, accordingly, dismissed.

Pending applications, if any, are also stand disposed of.

C.A. No. 11383/2017:

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

We do not find any ground to interfere with the impugned order. However, this order will not affect the remedy of the

appellants under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.

The appeal is disposed of in above terms.

SLP(C) No. 15059/2011, SLP(C) No. 12478/2016, SLP(C) No. 17070/2017, SLP(C) No. 18212/2017, SLP(C) No. 25319/2017, SLP(C) No. 25321/2017, Diary No(s). 23682/2017, Diary No(s). 23685/2017 SLP(C) Nos.1635-1637/2018, SLP(C) No. 1631-1633/2018, SLP(C) No.21434/2017:

List these matters along with C.A. Nos.8984-8985/2017 & SLP(C) No.24172/2017 on Tuesday i.e. 13th March, 2018.

.....J.
[ADARSH KUMAR GOEL]

.....J.
[ROHINTON FALI NARIMAN]

.....J.
[UDAY UMESH LALIT]

NEW DELHI
8th March, 2018

ITEM NO.102

COURT NO.11

SECTION IV-A

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

Civil Appeal No(s). 974/2012

**MADHYA PRADESH RURAL ROAD
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & ANR.**

APPELLANTS

VERSUS

M/S. L.G. CHAUDHARY ENGINEERS AND CONTRACTORS

RESPONDENT

**(FOR [APPLICATION FOR INTERVENTION] ON I.A.NO.3 AND [APPLICATION
FOR INTERVENTION] ON IA 102347/2013 AND I.A. NO.58149 - APPLICATION
FOR INTERVENTION AND I.A.NO.58152 - APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM
FILING O.T. AND I.A. (UNREGISTERED) - APPLICATION FOR DIRECTION)**

WITH

SLP(C) No. 15059/2011 (III)

(FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING ON IA 1/2011)

SLP(C) No. 16889/2012 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 11615/2012 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 11617/2012 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 11618/2012 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 11619/2012 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 35641/2011 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 11633-11634/2012 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 11631-11632/2012 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 11628-11629/2012 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 796/2014 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 12478/2016 (IV-A)

(IA No./- and IA No.24473/2018-PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS)

SLP(C) No. 19637/2017 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 21017/2017 (IV-A)

(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 44415/2017)

SLP(C) No. 7416/2017 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 21037/2017 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 30773/2017 (IV-A)
(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 95272/2017)

SLP(C) No. 23107/2017 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 7407/2017 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 5076/2017 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 20744/2017 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 17070/2017 (IV-A)
(IA No.14943/2018-INTERVENTION APPLICATION)

SLP(C) No. 18212/2017 (XVI)
(IA No.58039/2017-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

SLP(C) No. 25319/2017 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 25321/2017 (IV-A)

SLP(C) No. 21434/2017 (XVI)

Diary No(s). 23682/2017 (IV-A)
(IA No.114466/2017-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA
No.114463/2017-PERMISSION TO FILE SLP/TP and IA No.114468/2017-
CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING)

Diary No(s). 23685/2017 (IV-A)
(IA No./- and IA No.13117/2018-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and
IA No.13118/2018-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING and IA
No.13121/2018-PERMISSION TO FILE SLP/TP)

C.A. No. 11383/2017 (IV-A)
(IA No.8348/2018-CLARIFICATION/DIRECTION)

SLP(C) No. 1635-1637/2018 (IV-A)
(IA No.133002/2017-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA
No.133005/2017-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT
and IA No.133001/2017-PERMISSION TO FILE SLP/TP and IA
No.133003/2017-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING and IA
No.133004/2017-PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS)

SLP(C) No. 1631-1633/2018 (IV-A)

Date : 08-03-2018 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ADARSH KUMAR GOEL
 HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHINTON FALI NARIMAN
 HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE UDAY UMESH LALIT

For Parties(s)

Ms. Meenakshi Arora, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Rahul Narayan, Adv.
 Mr. Shashwant Goel, Adv.
 Mr. Anand Kumar Sethi, Adv.

Ms. Vibha D. Makhija, Sr. Adv.
 Ms. Abha R. Sharma, AOR
 Mr. D.S. Parmar, Adv.

Mr. Naman Nagrath, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Aman Pandey, Adv.
 Mr. Harsh Parashar, AOR
 Mr. Varun Amar, Adv.

Mr. Naman Nagrath, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Jay Savla, AOR
 Ms. Renuka Sahu, Adv.
 Mr. Prabhat Chaurasia, Adv.
 Mr. Jasdeep Singh Dhillon, Adv.

Mr. Brajesh Pandey, Adv.
 Mr. Vasu B., Adv.
 Ms. Spiti Sarkar, Adv.
 Dr. Kailash Chand, AOR

Mr. Tripura Ray, Adv.
 Mr. B.S. Billowria, Adv.
 Mr. Suresh Kumar Sharma, Adv.
 Mr. Vishnu Sharma, AOR

Mr. Atul Jha, Adv.
 Mr. Sandeep Jha, Adv.
 Mr. Dharmendra Kumar Sinha, AOR

Mr. Varun Amar, Adv.
 Mr. Shantanu Krishna, AOR

Mr. Preetesh Kapoor, Adv.
 Ms. Hemantika Wahi, AOR
 Ms. Jesal Wahi, Adv.
 Ms. Mamta Singh, Adv.

Mr. Apoorv Kurup, AOR
 Mr. Anupam, Adv.
 Mr. A.C. Boxipatro, Adv.

Dr. Manish Singhvi, Adv.
 Mr. Prashant Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Saurabh S. Sinha, Adv.

for M/S. Ap & J Chambers, AOR

Mr. Shekhar Sharma, Adv.
Mr. A.P. Dhamija, Adv.
Mr. Sarad Kumar Singhanian, AOR

Mr. Rajesh Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Nitin Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Rajeev Kumar Gupta, Adv.
Ms. Shalu Sharma, AOR

Mr. Vivek Singh, Adv.
Mr. Mohit Darad, Adv.
Mr. Anand Dixit L., Adv.
Mr. Vardhman Kaushik, Adv.
Ms. Monalisa Kosaria, Adv.
Mr. Chandra Prakash, AOR

Mr. M. R. Shamshad, AOR
Mr. Aditya Samaddar, Adv.
Ms. Rimjhim Naudial, Adv.

Mr. Nishe Rajen Shonker, AOR
Mr. Anu K. Joy, Adv.
Mr. Alim Anuar, Adv.

Ms. Pragati Neekhara, AOR
Mr. Ajay Assudani, Adv.
Mr. Surya Narayana Singh, Adv.
Ms. Kaveri Vats, Adv.

Mr. K. Krishna Kumar, AOR
Ms. Anuradha Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Mishra Saurabh, AOR
Mr. Ankit Kumar Lal, Adv.
Mr. Arjun Garg, Adv.

Mr. Jaspreet Singh Rai, Adv.
Mr. Rohit Nagpal, Adv.
Mr. Harpreet Singh Rai, Adv.
Ms. Harsimran Rana Rai, Adv.
Ms. Sukhdeep Rana Rai, Adv.
Mr. Shyamal Kumar, AOR

Mr. Shivam Singh, Adv.
Mr. Apoorva Srivastava, Adv.
Ms. Sugandha Batra, Adv.
Mr. Ranjan Kumar Pandey, AOR

Mr. Shivam Singh, Adv.
Mr. Apoorva Srivastava, Adv.
Ms. Sugandha Batra, Adv.

Mr. Chandan Kumar, AOR

Mr. Prateek Khanna, Adv.

Dr. (mrs.) Vipin Gupta, AOR

Mr. Niraj Sharma, AOR

Mr. Rahul Narayan, AOR

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

Except the matters which are referred to a three-Judge Bench, all other matters are not necessary to be heard by a Three-Judge Bench and the same are detagged and be heard separately.

C.A. No.974 of 2012:

In terms of the signed order, the reference in C.A.No.974 of 2012 is answered and the appeal is disposed of accordingly.

Pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

I.A. NO.3 in C.A. No.974/2012:

On oral prayer let the application for intervention be treated as special leave petition and listed separately. Let a formal special leave petition be filed by the applicant. The respondent(s) will be at liberty to file a counter affidavit.

Needful be done by the applicant within one week.

Post the matter after two weeks thereafter.

C.A. No.2615 of 2018 @ SLP(C) No.16889/2012:

Leave granted.

The appeal is allowed in terms of the signed order.

Pending applications, if any, are also stand disposed of.

C.A. No.2751 of 2018 @ SLP(C) No. 11615/2012, C.A. No.2753 of 2018 @ SLP(C) No. 11617/2012, C.A. No.2754 of 2018 @ SLP(C)

No.11618/2012, C.A. No.2755 of 2018 @ SLP(C) No. 11619/2012, C.A. Nos.2756-2757 of 2018 @ SLP(C) Nos. 11633-11634/2012, C.A. Nos.2758-2759 of 2018 @ SLP(C) Nos. 11631-11632/2012 & C.A. Nos.2760-2761 of 2018 @ SLP(C) No. 11628-11629/2012:

Leave granted.

The appeals are disposed of in terms of the signed order.

Pending applications, if any, are also stand disposed of.

C.A. No.2616 @ SLP(C) No. 35641/2011:

Leave granted.

The appeal is allowed in terms of the signed order.

Pending applications, if any, are also stand disposed of.

C.A. No.2762 of 2018 SLP(C) No. 796/2014:

Leave granted.

The appeal is disposed of in above terms.

Pending applications, if any, are also stand disposed of.

SLP(C) No. 19637/2017, SLP(C) No. 21017/2017, SLP(C) No. 7416/2017, SLP(C) No. 21037/2017, SLP(C) No. 30773/2017, SLP(C) No. 23107/2017, SLP(C) No. 7407/2017, SLP(C) No. 5076/2017 & SLP(C) No. 20744/2017:

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

We do not find any ground to interfere with the impugned order. The special leave petitions are, accordingly, dismissed.

Pending applications, if any, are also stand disposed of.

C.A. No. 11383/2017:

The appeal is disposed of in terms of the signed order.

Pending applications, if any, are also stand disposed of.

SLP(C) No.15059/2011, SLP(C) No. 12478/2016, SLP(C) No. 17070/2017, SLP(C) No. 18212/2017, SLP(C) No. 25319/2017, SLP(C) No. 25321/2017, Diary No(s). 23682/2017, Diary No(s). 23685/2017, SLP(C) Nos.1635-1637/2018, SLP(C) No. 1631-1633/2018 & SLP(C) No.21434/2017:

List these matters along with C.A. Nos.8984-8985/2017 & SLP(C) No.24172/2017 on Tuesday i.e. 13th March, 2018.

(MAHABIR SINGH)
COURT MASTER

(MADHU BALA)
COURT MASTER

(SWETA DHYANI)
SENIOR PERSONAL ASSISTANT

(PARVEEN KUMARI PASRICHA)
COURT MASTER

(Signed order is placed on the file)