

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO.1706 OF 2014

(Chaman Metalics Ltd. vs. Union of India and Ors.)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr.D.V.Chauhan, Adv. for the petitioner.
Mr.Rohit Deo, ASGI for respondent nos.1 & 2.
Mr.N.R.Rode, A.G.P. for respondent no.3.
Mr.Nirbhay Chauhan, Adv. h/f. Mr.M. Anilkumar,
Adv. for respondent no.4.

CORAM : B.P.DHARMADHIKARI &
A.P.BHANGALE, JJ.

DATE : 12th JANUARY, 2015.

Heard the learned Counsel for the respective parties.

Mr.D.V.Chauhan, learned Counsel for the petitioner states that the questions arising from invocation of bank guarantee were looked into by the 28th meeting of the Inter-Ministerial Group (IMG) and it's minutes form part of Office memorandum dt.1.1.2015. The said group, after considering the orders passed by the Delhi High Court, found it necessary to issue a show cause notice before invoking bank guarantee. Accordingly, the petitioner is likely to receive the show cause notice. The Government of India has called upon the petitioner to extend the period of bank guarantee vide communication dt.10.12.2014.

Communication dt.10.12.2014 produced by Mr.D.V.Chauhan, learned Counsel for the petitioner is taken on record and is marked as 'X' for identification. Office

memorandum dt.1.1.2015 with minutes of 28th meeting of Inter-Ministerial Group is also taken on record and marked as 'Y' for identification.

Mr.Rohit Deo, learned Assistant Solicitor General of India for respondent nos.1 and 2 states that though he has no instructions on this development, in the light of the documents produced on record, this Court may pass suitable orders.

Learned Counsel for the other respective parties also state that the Court may consider the documents.

The documents show that the threatened action may not materialize till the petitioner receives a show cause notice and proper opportunity is given to him. The challenge is, therefore, rendered infructuous atleast for the present.

In the circumstances, in the light of subsequent developments, we dispose of the Writ Petition as 'infructuous'. No costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE