* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Date of decision: 20th January, 2015

\+ **W.P.(C) 3673/2013 & CM Nos.15368/2013 & 10465/2014**

RAM NIWAS JAIN ..... **Petitioner**

Through: Mr. Pravir Chowdhury, Adv.

Versus

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS & OTHERS ..... **Respondents**

Through: Mr. Saqib, Adv. for R-1.
Mr. R.V. Sinha, Standing Counsel for CBI.
Mr. Rajiv Nanda, Addl. Standing Counsel, GNCTD for R-4 and 5.
Mr. Sanjay Poddar, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pathak, Mr. Govind Kumar & Mr. Anshuman Nayak, Adv. for R-6 to 8.
Mr. Prabhat Kumar, Adv. for the applicant in CM No.15368/2013.

CORAM:
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J.

1. This petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India was filed as a Public Interest Litigation (PIL), pleading:

(i) that the petitioner had 'recently' come to know of a big land scam carried out by the officials of the Land & Building Department of the Govt. of NCT of Delhi and was hence filing the petition to protect the public land;

(ii) that the petitioner had learnt that certain persons including respondents no. 7 and 8 i.e. Additional Secretary, Land & Building Department and ASC-cum-ACG of the said Department had tampered and forged documents to procure allotment of government land, without any justification and the officials who were responsible for protecting the government land had colluded, having vested interest;

(iii) that the residents of Delhi were adversely affected due to such illegal allotment of land, on the basis of forged and fabricated documents, inasmuch as making of such illegal allotment of land was to the prejudice of residents of Delhi genuinely entitled to government land;

(iv) that the petitioner is a public spirited person running a proprietorship trade and business and is an income tax payee having satisfactory financial condition and is ready to bear the cost, if imposed by this Court;

(v) that though the petitioner prior to filing of the petition, had represented *inter alia* to the respondents no. 1 to 6 i.e. Govt. of India, Central Vigilance Commission (CVC), Central Bureau of

Investigation (CBI) and various other offices of GNCTD as well as to various other authorities, but no action had been taken;

(vi) that claim of one Mst. Waziran in whom the officials had a vested interest had been allowed with respect to land comprised in Khasra No.143, 695, 172, 340 and 343 of Village Gadaipur, Mehrauli, Delhi, by tampering the revenue record; the land entitlement of the said Mst. Waziran had been calculated as 72 bighas, in place of 5 bighas and 12 biswas only which was owned by the husband of Mst. Waziran;

(vii) that neither the husband of Mst. Waziran nor Mst. Waziran had ever in the past made a claim for 72 bighas of land, which was made belatedly in the year 2006;

(viii) that the documents of the year 1996, show that Islam, being the husband of Mst. Waziran, owned much smaller land than 72 bighas, to which Mst. Waziran had been found entitled and had been allotted in Village Gadaipur, Mehrauli, New Delhi;

(ix) that as part of the said manipulation, land recorded in the revenue records in the name of one Nasiruddin who had no connection with Mst. Waziran had also been allotted to Mst. Waziran;

(x) that the manipulation of revenue records was apparent on the face of the record;

(xi) that though Mst. Waziran on an earlier occasion, in a judicial record, had given a statement that she did not know any person by the name of Nasiruddin, however the said document had been removed from the judicial records;

(xii) that the petition is not guided by self gain of the petitioner or any other person, institution, body and that there is no motive other than of public interest in filing the petition.

Accordingly, the relief of directing the authorities i.e. respondent no. 1 to 6 viz. the Ministry of Home Affairs, Central Vigilance Commission (CVC), Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI), Govt. of NCT of Delhi (GNCTD) and Directorate of Vigilance, GNCTD to investigate into the matter and the complaints made by the petitioner and of ultimate cancellation of allotment of land admeasuring 72 bighas 2 biswas in Khasra No.143, 695, 172, 340 and 343 at Village Gadaipur, Mehrauli, New Delhi in favour of Mst. Waziran was claimed.

2. Though the petition was prefaced with a plea of flagging a "big land scam" but as the aforesaid would show, was directed solely against the allotment of land made in favour of Mst. Waziran. However, surprisingly the said Mst. Waziran was not made a respondent in the petition.

3. The petition was entertained and notice thereof issued.

4. CM No.15368/2013 was filed by Mst. Waziran for impleadment as a party to this petition, pleading *inter alia* that the present petition though titled as a PIL was the outcome of a personal / family dispute between the said Mst. Waziran and her brother-in-law Mohd. Akhtar who, on the basis of forged and fabricated documents, had purported to transfer her land to one Ms. Suman Jain wife of Mr. V.K. Jain; that Mst. Waziran, on coming to know of the same had approached the Economic Offences Wing, Crime Branch, Delhi Police and FIR No.37/2012 in this regard registered; that during investigation, the documents fabricated / manufactured by Mohd. Akhtar in collusion with Mr. V.K. Jain were sent to CFSL for forensic examination and report whereof was that the signatures purportedly of Mst. Waziran thereon were in fact not of Mst. Waziran. It was further pleaded that the said Mohd. Akhtar and Mr. V.K. Jain along with their accomplices since then had been harassing and threatening Mst. Waziran and in which

respect, on failure of the police to register another FIR, a complaint under Section 156(3) CrPC had been filed. It was the case of Mst. Waziran, that the present PIL is at the instance of the said Mr. V.K. Jain.

5. The aforesaid application of Mst. Waziran came up before this Court first on 13th November, 2013 when the counsel for Mst. Waziran contended that the petitioner Mr. Ram Niwas Jain is related to Ms. Suman Jain wife of Mr. V.K. Jain who is the accused in FIR No.37/2012 supra. The counsel then appearing for the respondents No.7&8 also stated that some of the documents filed along with this petition had in fact been supplied by the office of the respondents to Mohd. Akhtar and on the basis thereof he also supported the contention of Mst. Waziran that the present petition had been filed at the instance of Mohd. Akhtar and Ms. Suman Jain, in the garb of a PIL.

6. This Court, vide order dated 13th November, 2013, "keeping in view the serious allegations" of misuse of PIL and taking note of the fact that a large number of private interest litigation are being filed in the guise of public interest litigation, to settle private lis, directed the CBI to conduct a preliminary inquiry to the limited extent to find out relationship of the petitioner with any of the accused in FIR No.37/2012 as well as whether the

present petition had been filed at the instance of Mohd. Akhtar or of Ms. Suman Jain or of any other accused in the FIR.

7. CBI filed a status report dated 6th February, 2014 to the extent that the petitioner in this PIL is related to Mr. V.K. Jain and that Mr. V.K. Jain and his family were involved in the present PIL for their personal interest. It was further informed that a large number of telephone calls were exchanged between Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate then appearing for the petitioner and Mr. V.K. Jain.

8. When the aforesaid report of the CBI came before this Court on 7th February, 2014, Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate did not deny the relationship between the petitioner and Mr. V.K. Jain or that large number of telephone calls were exchanged between him and Mr. V.K. Jain and stated that he was the counsel of Mr. V.K. Jain in as many as ten matters and that the telephone calls exchanged by him with Mr. V.K. Jain were in connection with those other matters and insisted that this PIL had nothing to do with the relationship between the petitioner and Mr. V.K. Jain or the fact he himself was the counsel of Mr. V.K. Jain in other matters. However, when we enquired from Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate, whether not as per the Rules pertaining to PILs framed by this Court, he was required to disclose the said

facts, Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate sought permission to withdraw himself from the brief. However, since none else was present for the petitioner, we directed the personal appearance of the petitioner on the next date of hearing.

9. Though Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate on 7th February, 2014 had withdrawn himself from the brief but on 26th February, 2014 when the matter came up before a Bench other than the Bench which had quizzed him on 7th February, 2014, he again appeared. On that date, the matter was simply renotified to 14th July, 2014.

10. On 14th July, 2014, none appeared for the petitioner. Bailable warrants were accordingly issued for production of the petitioner.

11. The petitioner appeared before this Court on 20th August, 2014 through another Advocate and controverted that the present petition in the garb of PIL was filed for personal reasons. This Court, being *prima facie* of the view that the action of the petitioner in filing this PIL by suppressing the true facts, amounted to obstructing administration of justice, we called upon the petitioner to show cause as to why proceedings should not be initiated against him under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 for criminal contempt.

12. The petitioner has filed an affidavit dated 16th September, 2014 by way of reply to the show cause notice supra served on him, reiterating the

contents of the writ petition and with respect to the report of the CBI, pleading:

(a) that the conclusion drawn by CBI, from the factum of the petitioner along with the petition having filed documents which were supplied to Mohd. Akhtar to the effect that the petitioner is the shadow of Mr. V.K. Jain, Ms. Suman Jain, Mr. Puneet Kumar Jain and Mohd. Akhtar, is erroneous inasmuch as the said documents were supplied to the petitioner by one Mr. Shahid Ul Haq who was not connected to V.K. Jain, Ms. Suman Jain, Mr. Puneet Kumar Jain and Mohd. Akhtar;

(b) that the CBI had failed to examine Mohd. Akhtar;

(c) that all information pertaining to the said land scam had been obtained by the petitioner from the said Mr. Shahid Ul Haq who is a Urdu Translator working outside the office of the Tehsildar, Mehrauli;

(d) that the said Mr. Shahid Ul Haq had denied having received documents from the said Mohd. Akhtar;

(e) that it was not necessary for the petitioner in this PIL to disclose his relationship with Mr. V.K. Jain and Ms. Suman Jain;

(f) that though Mr. V.K. Jain is cousin of the petitioner but this relationship has nothing to do with filing of this petition;

(g) that there is no link to connect the petitioner with Mohd. Akhtar and there is nothing to conclude that the petitioner acted as a shadow at the behest of Mohd. Akhtar;

(h) that the petitioner is in no way connected with any of the business or activities of Mr. V.K. Jain which are subject matter of FIR No.37/2012;

(i) that the subject matter of FIR was some other land than the land admeasuring 72 bighas and 2 biswas, subject matter of the present petition;

(j) that though there were 453 calls made during the course of one year between the petitioner and Mr. V.K. Jain and Mr. Puneet Kumar Jain but the same amounted to only one call per day;

(k) that the CBI did not consider the possibility of other family members of petitioner and Mr. V.K. Jain using the said mobile phones to talk to each other;

(l) that though Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate was the Advocate for Mr. V.K. Jain, the said Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate had been engaged by the petitioner in this PIL as Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate is also known to the petitioner and had dealt with some litigations of the petitioner in the past;

(m) that 647 telephone calls between Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate and Mr. V.K. Jain were in relation to the other cases of Mr. V.K. Jain being handled by Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate;

(n) that FIR No.37/2012 cannot be permitted to be used as a shield to prevent the unearthing of the huge land scam of illegal allotment of 72 bighas 2 biswas of govt. land in Village Gadaipur, Mehrauli to Mst. Waziran;

(o) that the factum of the petitioner filing the present petition did not amount to contempt of Court within the parameters laid down by the Supreme Court in ***Delhi Judicial Services Association Vs. State of Gujarat*** (1991) 4 SCC 406;

(p) that no relevant facts had been suppressed by the petitioner from the petition;

(q) that there is till date nothing to show that the petitioner had any personal interest in filing the PIL or that the filing of the present petition would confer any personal benefit to Mr. V.K. Jain;

(r) that the petitioner is not trying to protect Mr. V.K. Jain in any manner whatsoever;

(s) that this Court, instead of proceeding with the petition and verifying whether public land had been wrongly allotted to Mst. Waziran had started inquiring against the petitioner;

(t) that the ingredients of Section 14 of the Contempt of Courts Act are not satisfied;

(u) that the petitioner ought not to be penalized for flagging illegal allotment of govt. land;

(v) that the conclusion drawn by CBI that the present petition is guided by personal motives is erroneous, as the petitioner is in no way connected to the disputes between Mst. Waziran and Mr. V.K. Jain.

Accordingly, the *suo moto* contempt proceedings initiated against him should be dropped and the PIL should be proceeded with further.

13. Thereafter, when the matter came up on 3rd December, 2014, adjournment was sought on the ground that the petitioner had preferred a Special Leave Petition (SLP) to the Supreme Court against the order dated 20th August, 2014 and which was posted on 8th December, 2014.

14. The counsel for the petitioner during the hearing on 11th December, 2014 argued on the same lines as affidavit above. On his request for giving permission to file written submissions, judgment was reserved. Written submissions have been filed by the counsel for the petitioner reiterating the aforesaid pleas.

15. We may at the outset state that though the petitioner has prefaced the affidavit by way of reply to the notice issued to him as well as the written arguments with an unconditional apology and seeking pardon "in case this Hon'ble Court is still of the view that the contemnor had committed contempt" of this Court but neither the petitioner nor the counsel during the hearing adverted thereto and have rather contested the notice supra issued to the petitioner. The Supreme Court recently in ***Bal Kishan Giri Vs. State of U.P.*** (2014) 7 SCC 280 has held that apology should be unquestionable in sincerity, tempered with sense of genuine remorse and repentance, and not a calculated strategy to avoid punishment. It was held that apology, when

hollow, cannot be accepted as it is then a "paper apology". It was further held that expression of sorrow has to come from the heart and not from the pen, for it is one thing to 'say sorry' and it is another to 'feel sorry'. Applying the said tests, the question of considering the apology, only on paper, does not arise.

16. The tool of PIL, enabling the High Courts and the Supreme Court to be approached by a person, without any cause of action or personal injury to himself / herself being shown, as was the fundamental requirement till then was for approaching the Court, was devised by the Supreme Court to provide access to Courts and to justice to persons who were unable to do so themselves for the reason of social or economic backwardness. The tool of PIL was subsequently extended, also to matters where the injury, instead of being to any particular person, was to the entire citizenry or a section thereof. Since in PILs, the petitioner had no personal interest and was merely, in a public spirit, flagging an issue concerning somebody else who was himself / herself / themselves unable to access the Courts for justice or as members of the public in general, the Courts in PILs also started relaxing the rule, of the burden of proof / onus being on the person approaching the Court. However, soon it was realized that taking advantage of such leniency and which

resulted in the Courts sometimes instead of adjudicatory, also entering into the domain of investigatory role, the said tool of PIL came to be misused. The Supreme Court, ultimately in ***State of Uttaranchal Vs. Balwant Singh Chaufal*** (2010) 3 SCC 402 issued broad guidelines with respect to PILs and directed the High Courts to frame rules with respect to PILs to curb the misuse thereof. Subsequently, in ***State of U.P. Vs. Neeraj Chaubey*** (2010) 10 SCC 320 was also directed that PILs should generally be heard only by the Bench designated by the Chief Justice of the High Court.

17. This Court also, in pursuance to the said directions, has framed the rules for PILs in 2010 , titled Delhi High Court (Public Interest Litigation) Rules, 2010 so as to nip in the bud the possibility of misuse of PILs. The said rules *inter alia* require the petitioner to in the petition itself, make a declaration that the petitioner has no personal interest in the litigation and that the petition is not guided by self gain or for gain of any other person/institution/body and that there is no motive other that that of public interest in filing the writ petition. The petitioner, in compliance with such rules, has made such a declaration in the petition.

18. However, what the CBI in pursuance to the inquiry ordered by this Court, has reported, is:

(A) that the petitioner during inquiry accepted that Mr. V.K. Jain is his cousin;

(B) the petitioner claimed that he had obtained photocopies of certified copies filed along with the petition from Mr. Shahid Ul Haq who is an Urdu Translator working outside the office of the Tehsil, Mehrauli, New Delhi;

(C) that the said certified copies had in fact been applied for by Mohd. Akhtar;

(D) that the wife of said Mr. V.K. Jain claims to have acquired some immovable property from Mohd. Akhtar and in relation to which immovable property, Mst. Waziran has filed FIR No.37/2012 against Mohd. Akhtar and Mr. V.K. Jain and his wife;

(E) that Mr. V.K. Jain also admitted knowledge of the present PIL, though denied having any concern therewith;

(F) that Mst. Waziran claimed of being pressurized to withdraw the FIR and of which threat she had filed complaint;

(G) that 453 telephone calls were exchanged between Mr. V.K. Jain and the petitioner between December, 2012 and November, 2013 and from which it is evident that the petitioner has been in constant touch with Mr. V.K. Jain;

(H) that during the pendency of the present petition itself (from May, 2013 onwards), there were 5 calls between the petitioner and Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate, while there were 460 calls between Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate and Mr. V.K. Jain and which established that even the Advocate for the petitioner was in constant touch with Mr. V.K. Jain rather than with the petitioner;

(I) that Mr. Shahid Ul Haq from whom the petitioner claimed to have collected photocopies of the certified copies filed before this Court had admitted providing photocopies to the petitioner but the said certified copies had been applied for by Mohd. Akhtar;

(J) that Mohd. Akhtar despite summoning did not join the investigation on the pretext that either he was out of town or unwell.

19. We had during the hearing enquired, what the business of the petitioner was/is and were told that he is carrying the business of trading in wires at Shahbad Extension. Since the petitioner, though in the petition claimed to be a public spirited person but has not stated having filed any other PIL in the past, we had during the hearing also enquired, whether the

petitioner in the past had filed any PIL or done anything else in public interest. Nothing was informed. Further, since the petition though purporting to draw the attention of this Court to a big land scam, was in fact directed against only one transaction concerning Mst. Waziran and finding that the petitioner had not disclosed in the petition, as to how his attention was drawn to the said transaction, we had further enquired from the counsel for the petitioner, as to how the petitioner came to know of and got interested and made enquires about the said transaction. Again, no reply was forthcoming. The counsel for the petitioner could not also tell, as to how the petitioner came to approach Mr. Shahid Ul Haq from whom he claimed to have collected photocopies of certain certified copies filed before this Court. Though it was claimed that Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate through whom the petitioner had filed this petition, was counsel for the petitioner in some litigations, but no particulars of those litigations also were forthcoming. No proof of payment of any professional fee by the petitioner to Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate also has been furnished. On the contrary, it is admitted that Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate who has filed this petition on behalf of the petitioner is the regular Advocate of Mr. V.K. Jain.

20. In the face of the aforesaid, the inference is clear and strong that the petitioner has merely lent his name to the present petition which in fact has been filed at the instance of Mr. V.K. Jain who is involved in litigation with Mst. Waziran. The huge disparity in the number of telephone calls which Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate exchanged with the petitioner (i.e. 5 in number) and which he exchanged with Mr. V.K. Jain (i.e. 647 in number) during the pendency of this petition also speaks volumes in favour of the instructions qua this petition to Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate flowing from Mr. V.K. Jain and not from the petitioner. Though it was vaguely claimed that the said 647 telephone calls were in the context of other litigations which Mr. S.D. Singh, Advocate is handling for Mr. V.K. Jain and his family and not in the context of present litigation but neither any details of the said litigations were given nor any dates of hearing therein to show that the telephone calls were in relation thereto.

21. In the aforesaid facts and circumstances, we have no hesitation whatsoever in concluding, not only that the petitioner in the present petition filed as PIL, falsely declared:

(i) that there is no personal interest involved; and,

(ii) that the petition is not guided by self gain or the gain of any other person;

but also that the defence of the petitioner to the show cause notice issued to him is false and the petitioner therein has persisted in the falsity.

22. The contention of the counsel for the petitioner that the subject matter of the present petition is different from the subject matter of FIR No.37/2012, is also of no avail. Mr. V.K. Jain who we have found to be the face behind this petition, is claiming to have validly acquired the land subject matter of FIR No.37/2012, which Mst. Waziran is claiming to be hers. Naturally, Mr. V.K. Jain would not be interested in losing that land. It is clear, that the petitioner in this PIL, on behalf of Mr. V.K. Jain is seeking investigation into allotment of another land to Mst. Waziran.The only reason could be to pressurize Mst. Waziran to not challenge the transfer of the land, subject matter of FIR No.37/2012 to Mr. V.K. Jain. The petitioner has clearly been privy, rather guilty of not only making false declarations on oath before this Court but has also been privy to abuse of the process of this Court.

23. The Supreme Court in ***K.D. Sharma v. Steel Authority of India Ltd.*** (2008) 12 SCC 481 reiterated in ***Kishore Samrite Vs. State of U.P.*** (2013) 2 SCC 398 held that a litigant who plays hide & seek with the courts or adopts

pick and choose and does not come with candid facts and clean breast is required to be dealt with for contempt of Court for abusing the process of the Court. Similarly in ***Narmada Bachao Andolan Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh*** (2011) 7 SCC 639, it was held that a person seeking relief in public interest should approach the court of equity not only with clean hands but also with a clean mind, clean heart and clean objective and that whenever the Court comes to the conclusion that the process of the Court is being abused, the Court would be justified in refusing to proceed further with the matter. A false statement made in the Court or in the pleadings, intentionally to mislead the Court and obtain a favourable order was held to be amounting to criminal contempt as it tends to impede the administration of justice, adversely affecting the interest of the public in the administration of justice. It was held that false statements obstruct the due course of justice and undermine the very flow of the unsoiled stream of justice which has to be kept clear and pure and no one can be permitted to take liberties with it by soiling its purity. Earlier also, in ***Dhananjay Sharma Vs. State of Haryana*** (1995) 3 SCC 757 the Supreme Court had ordered the CBI to inquire into the truthfulness of the allegations made in the petition and on the basis of the CBI report had held the said averments to be false and held the petitioner in that case to be guilty of criminal contempt and meted out punishment to him. Infact, it was for the first time in ***Chandra Shashi Vs. Anil Kumar Verma*** (1995) 1 SCC 421 that immoral acts of perjury, pre-variation and motivated falsehoods were held to be amounting to criminal contempt observing that if such actions were not appropriately dealt with, it would not be possible for any court to administer justice in the true sense and to the satisfaction of those who approach it in the hope that truth would ultimately prevail. It was further held that if recourse to falsehood is taken with oblique motive, the same would definitely hinder, hamper or impede even flow of justice and would prevent the courts from performing their legal duties as they are supposed to do.

24. Though the petitioner has not raised any argument with respect to the procedure followed by us but we may record that this Court by virtue of Article 215 of the Constitution of India is entitled to punish for contempt of itself and we find the acts of the petitioner of making false statements in the petition and in the affidavit accompanying the petition, with an oblique motive, to obtain a favourable order to be amounting to criminal contempt. We have given sufficient opportunity to the petitioner to show cause and now proceed to punish the petitioner therefor.

25. We are of the view that after the warning sounded by the Supreme Court and the Rules relating to PILs framed by this Court, the petitioner cannot be heard to say that the filing of this PIL directed against one individual only and with whom a close relative of the petitioner had reasons to settle score with and with which close relative the petitioner as well as his Advocate were in constant touch, has nothing to do with the said close relative or his dispute with the person against whom the PIL is directed or that the petitioner was not required to disclose the said facts to this Court. We have pondered over the punishment to be meted out to the petitioner. The filing of the false affidavit by the petitioner, knowing the same to be false, in our view cannot be treated lightly. The law and the Courts should not be seen to sit by limply, while those who defy it go free. (***Jennison Vs. Baker*** [1972] 1 All E.R. 997).

26. We accordingly:

(a) dismiss the present petition with costs of Rs.10,000/- payable by the petitioner to Mst. Waziran within one month;

(b) hold the petitioner guilty of criminal contempt of this Court;

(c) punish the petitioner with imprisonment for a period of three days;

(d) however, the said sentence imposed upon the petitioner is suspended for a period of one month to enable the petitioner to, if so desires, avail his remedy. Unless there is an order to the contrary, the petitioner to surrender himself to the Station House Officer (SHO), Police Station-Tilak Marg, New Delhi on the 31st day of this order and where upon he shall be incarcerated to serve the punishment imposed on him. Needless to state, if the petitioner does not surrender himself, the SHO, Police Station-Tilak Marg, New Delhi is directed to arrest the petitioner of whose address is given herein below:

"Mr. Ram Niwas Jain
S/o Mr. Rameshwar Das Jain,
R/o 44-45, Shahbad Extension
Near Sector 17, Rohini, Delhi-110042."

(e) the proceedings are disposed of.

List before the Registrar General of this Court on 27th February, 2015 to ensure compliance.

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J.

CHIEF JUSTICE

JANUARY 20, 2015/bs