

Supreme Court of India

Bhattad Leasing & Finance Co. Ltd vs Mr. Nusli Neville Wadia & Ors on 30 October, 1995

Equivalent citations: 1995 SCC, Supl. (4) 210 JT 1995 (8) 192

Author: K Ramaswamy

Bench: Ramaswamy, K.

PETITIONER:

BHATTAD LEASING & FINANCE CO. LTD.

Vs.

RESPONDENT:

MR. NUSLI NEVILLE WADIA & ORS.

DATE OF JUDGMENT 30/10/1995

BENCH:

RAMASWAMY, K.

BENCH:

RAMASWAMY, K.

HANSARIA B.L. (J)

CITATION:

1995 SCC Supl. (4) 210 JT 1995 (8) 192

1995 SCALE (6) 383

ACT:

HEADNOTE:

JUDGMENT:

O R D E R Leave granted.

Having heard all the counsel for both the parties in extenso and perusing relevant material on record, ultimately we conclude that this is not a case fit for convicting respondent No.5, 6 and 7 for violation of the status quo order made by the High Court on May 30, 1994. No case of contempt arises against respondents Nos.1 to 4. Though 6th respondent was served with the notice directing him to be present, he was not present. Had we been informed at the beginning, we would have taken appropriate steps for his presence by non-bailable warrants. But at the end of the arguments, we were informed of it. We strongly condemn his conduct as unbecoming of a responsible citizen.

However, these facts which emerged at the hearing are relevant facts to be considered for the purpose of disposal of the writ petition on merits. Since the writ petition is pending, we decline to express any opinion on the facts and circumstances and on merits. The contempt petition is

accordingly dismissed.

However, the High Court is requested to dispose of the writ petition as expeditiously as possible preferably within six months from the date of receipt of this order.

The Receiver's report disclosed that possession of 39000 sq. mts. of land was given by respondent Nos.5 and 6 to the East West Development Company. In that behalf since the controversy was not focussed in the High Court and the matter has come to light only through the report submitted by the Court Receiver after the contempt proceedings were initiated, it is open to the petitioner to take appropriate action according to law. The appeal is dismissed accordingly.