

**CONTENTS**

Birju v. State of M. P.	..... 1047
Biswanath Bhattacharya v. Union of India & Others	..... 885
Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board and Others v. T.T. Murali Babu	..... 987
Dhanasekar (G.) v. M.D., Metropolitan Transport Corpn. Ltd.	..... 1021
Engineer Builder & Associates (M/s) v. Union of India & Irs.	..... 977
Gajanan Kamlya Patil v. Addl. Collector & Comp. Auth. & Ors.	..... 1032
Om Prakash Chautala v. Kanwar Bhan and Others	..... 939
Pasupuleti Siva Ramakrishna Rao v. State of A. P. & Ors.	..... 1139
Polamrasetti Manikyam & Anr. v. Teegala Venkata Ramayya & Anr.	..... 1127
Rameshchandra Ambalal Joshi v. The State of Gujarat and Anr.	..... 1112

Sanjay Kumar Shukla v. M/s Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ptd. & Ors.	..... 959
Sanjay Verma v. Haryana Roadways	..... 924
Sriharan (V.) @ Murugan v. Union of India & Ors.	..... 1093
Union of India v. M/s. Pam Development Pvt. Ltd.	..... 1069
Verma (V.K.) v. CBI	..... 1063
Vijay Kumar v. State of Rajasthan	..... 1078
Vijayander Kumar & Ors. v. State of Rajasthan & Anr.	..... 1012

**SUBJECT-INDEX****ANDHRA PRADESH COURT FEES AND SUITS****VALUATION ACT, 1956:**

s.37 - Computation of court fee in a suit for cancellation of sale deed - For the purpose of court fee and jurisdiction - Held: s.37 contains a special rule for valuing the property for the purpose of court fee and jurisdiction and there is no reason to substitute the expression "value of the property" used in s. 37 with the expression "market value of the property".

*Polamrasetti Manikyam & Anr. v. Teegala Venkata Ramayya & Anr.* ..... 1127

**ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION ACT, 1996:**

s.11(6) - Jurisdiction of arbitrator to entertain the dispute - Award by arbitrator - s.34 application by appellant for setting aside of award - Dismissed by High Court - Held: Although in the instant case, arbitration agreement provided for appointment of two arbitrators and an Umpire, however, in view of repeal of Arbitration Act, 1940 by Arbitration Act, 1996, the provision in the arbitration agreement for appointment of two arbitrators and an Umpire had become redundant - Appointment of arbitrator was not challenged by appellant and, therefore, the same became final and binding - This apart, appellant failed to raise objection regarding lack of jurisdiction of Arbitral Tribunal before arbitrator - Appellant not only filed the statement of defence but also raised a counter claim against the respondent and, therefore, objection is deemed to have been waived in view of the provisions contained in s.4 r/w s.16 of the Arbitration Act,

(iii)

1996 - High Court rightly held that the appellant having failed to raise the plea of jurisdiction before Arbitral Tribunal cannot be permitted to raise the plea before it for the first time - Doctrine/Principle - Principle of kompetenz-kompetenz.

*Union of India v. M/s Pam Development Pvt. Ltd.* ..... 1069

**CHENNAI METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE BOARD EMPLOYEES (DISCIPLINE AND APPEAL) REGULATIONS, 1978:**

Regulations 6(1) and 6(2).

(See under: Service Law) ..... 987

**CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE, 1973:**

(1) s.235(2) - Hearing on question of sentence - Held: In awarding sentence, in appropriate cases, while hearing the accused u/s 235(2), courts can also call for a report from Probation Officer and examine whether accused is likely to indulge in commission of any crime or there is any probability of accused being reformed and rehabilitated - Probation of Offenders Act, 1958.

(Also see under: Sentence/Sentencing).

*Birju v. State of M.P.* ..... 1047

(2) s.482 - Power of High Court to quash criminal proceedings - FIR filed for offences punishable u/ss 420 and 120-B IPC - Final report by police stating the case to be of a civil nature - Rejected by Magistrate and cognizance taken - Held: A given set of facts may make out a civil wrong as also a criminal offence and only because a civil remedy may also be available to informant/complainant that itself cannot be a ground to quash a criminal proceeding - Real test is whether allegations in

(v)

complaint disclose a criminal offence or not - When informant and witnesses have supported the allegations made in FIR, it would not be proper for the court to evaluate merits of allegations on the basis of documents annexed with memo of appeal - There is no good ground to interfere with criminal proceedings against appellants at this stage.

*Vijayander Kumar & Ors. v. State of Rajasthan & Anr.* ..... 1012

COMPENSATION:

(See under: Motor Vehicles Act, 1988) ..... 924  
and 1021

CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, 1950:

(1) Arts. 14, 31-B and 300A.  
(See under: Smugglers and Foreign Exchange Manipulators (Forfeiture of Property) Act, 1976) ..... 885

(2) Art. 20.  
(See under: Legislation) ..... 885

(3) Art. 21 - Reputation of a person is a noble asset and deserves protection u/Art. 21 - In courts, it must be safely guarded - When a court deals with a matter that has something likely to affect a person's reputation, the normative principles of law are to be cautiously and carefully adhered to - A person who is not a party in a case, his conduct cannot be commented upon - If he asks for expunction of remarks, same should not be denied.

*Om Prakash Chautala v. Kanwar Bhan and Others* ..... 939

(4) (i) Art. 21 r/w Art. 72/161- Delay in execution of death sentence - Delay of 11 years in decision of

(vi)

mercy petition under Art.72 - Held: Exorbitant delay in disposal of mercy petition renders the process of execution of death sentence arbitrary, whimsical and capricious and, therefore, inexecutable - Furthermore, such imprisonment, occasioned by inordinate delay in disposal of mercy petitions, is beyond the sentence accorded by the court and to that extent is extra-legal and excessive - The unreasonable delay caused qualifies as the supervening circumstance, which warrants for commutation of sentence of death into life imprisonment - Death sentence of three petitioners commuted into imprisonment for life - Life imprisonment means end of one's life, subject to remission - Sentence/Sentencing.

(ii) Art. 21 - Commutation of death sentence due to delay in its execution - Held: Prolonged delay in execution of death sentence, by itself, gives rise to mental suffering and agony which renders the subsequent execution of death sentence inhuman and barbaric - There is no obligation on the convict to demonstrate specific ill effects of suffering and agony on his mind and body as a prerequisite for commutation of sentence of death.

(iii) Arts. 72/161 - Delay in disposal of mercy petition - Held: Clemency procedure under Art. 72/161 provides a ray of hope to the condemned prisoner and his family members for commutation of death sentence into life imprisonment and, therefore, the executive should step up and exercise clemency power within a reasonable time - Another criteria may be added to the existing yardsticks so as to require consideration of the delay that may

(vii)

have occurred in disposal of a mercy petition.

(iv) Art.32 and Art. 72/161 - Writ petition for commutation of death sentence due to delay in decision of mercy petition - Scope of - Held: Relief sought for under these kinds of petitions is not per se review of the order passed under Art. 72/161 on merits but on the ground of violation of fundamental rights guaranteed under the Constitution to all the citizens including the death row convicts.

*V. Sriharan @ Murugan v. Union of India & Ors.* ..... 1093

(5) Art. 226 - Writ jurisdiction in contractual matter - Advertisement for award of dealership of retail outlets - Selection held and appellant placed at Sl.No.1 and respondent at Sl.No.2 - No Letter of Intent granted at that stage - Aggrieved by selection, respondent filed writ petition alleging that land offered by appellant was under litigation and was not immediately available for use of the retail outlet - Held: While writ petition was pending, partition suit was withdrawn and so there was a change in stand of District Authority regarding grant of NOC - Yet, same was not brought to notice of single Judge - That apart, relevant facts were ignored at different stages by High Court and in light of totality of facts there was a deliberate and not bona fide attempt on part of respondent to deny fruit of selection made in favour of appellant - Corporation is directed, if it is of view that operation of retail outlet is still justified by exigencies, to award the same to appellant by completing the requisite

(viii)

formalities in accordance with procedure laid down by Corporation itself.

*Sanjay Kumar Shukla v. M/s Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. & Ors.* ..... 959

(6) Art. 226. (See under: Delay/Laches) ..... 987

#### COURT FEE:

(See under: Andhra Pradesh Court Fees and Suit Valuation Act, 1956) ..... 1127

#### CRIMINAL LAW:

(1) (See under: Legislation) ..... 885

(2) (See under: Sentence/Sentencing) ..... 1047

#### DELAY/LACHES:

Misconduct - Dismissal from service - Four years delay in filing writ petition -Held: Doctrine of delay and laches should not be lightly brushed aside - A writ court is required to weigh the explanation offered and acceptability of the same - It is the duty of the court to scrutinize whether such enormous delay is to be ignored without any justification - That apart, in the instant case, such belated approach gains more significance as respondent-employee being absolutely careless to his duty and nurturing a lackadaisical attitude to responsibility had remained unauthorisedly absent - Such delay does not deserve any indulgence - Constitution of India, 1950 - Art. 226.

(Also see under: Service Law).

*Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board and others v. T.T. Murali Babu* ..... 987

## DOCTORINES/PRINCIPLES:

- (1) Doctrine of audi alteram partem.  
(See under: Party) ..... 939
- (2) Principle of kompetenz-kompetenz.  
(See under: Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996) ..... 1069

## EVIDENCE:

- (1) Circumstantial evidence.  
(See under: Penal Code, 1860) ..... 1078
- (2) Evidence of hostile witness - Held: Cannot be discarded as a whole and relevant parts thereof, which are admissible in law, can be used, either by prosecution or defence.  
(Also see under: Penal Code, 1860)  
*Birju v. State of M.P.* ..... 1047

## GENERAL CLAUSES ACT, 1897:

- ss.3(35) and 9.  
(See under: Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881) ..... 1112

## IDENTIFICATION:

- Identification of articles.  
(See under: Penal Code, 1860) ..... 1078

## INTERPRETATION OF STATUTES:

- Conflict between the provisions of the Act and provisions of the Schedule to the Act - Held: Provisions of the Act will prevail over provisions of Schedule.  
*M/s Engineer Builder & Associates v. Union of India & Ors.* ..... 977

## JAMMU AND KASHMIR ARBITRATION ACT, 1945:

- s.49(2); Fourth schedule - Application for setting

aside award - Limitation and condonation of delay - Held: s.49(2) prescribes a limitation of 30 days for filing an application for setting aside the award - Under s.5 of Jammu and Kashmir Limitation Act, period of limitation can be extended by court in respect of any application if it is satisfied that applicant had sufficient cause for not making the application within period of limitation - However, s.5 of Limitation Act does not apply to any application under any special or local law - The Act of 1945 does not provide anywhere that s.5, Limitation Act will apply to an application for setting aside an award u/ss.30 and 33 of Act of 1945 - Thus, court has no power to condone delay in filing an application for setting aside an award u/ss.30 and 33 of Act of 1945 - Jammu and Kashmir Limitation Act - s.5.

*M/s Engineer Builder & Associates v. Union of India & Ors.* ..... 977

## JAMMU AND KASHMIR LIMITATION ACT:

s.5.  
(See under: Jammu and Kashmir Arbitration Act, 1945) ..... 977

## JUDGES:

Role of Judges and judicial approach - Held: Judges must not unduly criticize conduct of parties and others - They should not be guided by any kind of notion - They must realize that they are not infallible and their unjust criticism may do harm - Judges must show judicial restraint - They must not do anything which blinds thinking process - They must show humility and chastity of thought

(xi)

which are bed rock of a civilized society - Judicial restraint.

(Also see under: Party).

*Om Prakash Chautala v. Kanwar Bhan and Others* ..... 939

JUDGMENTS/ORDERS:

Reasoned judgment - Held: A judgment may have rhetoric but the said rhetoric has to be dressed with reason and must be in accordance with legal principles, otherwise a mere rhetoric in a judgment, may likely to cause prejudice to a person and courts are not expected to give any kind of prejudicial remarks against a person, especially so, when he is not a party before it.

(Also see under: Party).

*Om Prakash Chautala v. Kanwar Bhan and Others* ..... 939

LEGISLATION:

Retrospective operation - Held: It is a well settled principle of constitutional law that sovereign legislative bodies can make laws with retrospective operation; and can make laws whose operation is dependent upon facts or events anterior to making of law - However, criminal law is excepted from such general Rule, under another equally well settled principle of constitutional law, i.e. no ex post facto legislation is permissible with respect to criminal law - Art. 20 contains such exception to general authority of sovereign legislature functioning under the Constitution to make retrospective or retroactive laws - Criminal law - Constitution of India, 1950 - Art. 20.

(xii)

(Also see under: Smugglers and Foreign Exchange Manipulators (Forfeiture of Property) Act, 1976).

*Biswanath Bhattacharya v. Union of India & Others* ..... 885

MOTIVE:

(See under: Sentence/Sentencing) ..... 1047

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT, 1988:

(1) s.166 - Compensation - Functional disability - Accident of victim's car with a bus resulting in fracture of victim's right arm and leg - Victim, a driver by profession - Tribunal held that negligence on part of driver of bus was root cause of accident, however, it further held that drivers of both the vehicles were equally responsible - Tribunal fixed liability of appellant at 50% while High Court reduced the liability to 30% - Held: Findings of tribunal were intra-contradictory - Therefore, first finding of Tribunal that negligence on part of bus driver was root cause of accident is restored - Appellant was a driver operating a tourist taxi - On account of physical disability suffered by him, he could not continue his avocation in the same manner as before - He was aged 46 years at the time of accident - Therefore, he ought to be given just and reasonable compensation for his functional disability as his income has been affected - Doctor assessed functional disability at 35% - Since appellant is compensated for functional disablement, he will not be entitled to any other compensation on account of physical disability or loss of earning capacity, etc - Appellant awarded

(xiii)

compensation of Rs.6,13,200/-.

*G. Dhanasekar v. M.D., Metropolitan Transport Corpn. Ltd.*

..... 1021

(2) s.166 - Just compensation - 25 years old self-employed accident victim suffered paralysis below waist and could not perform his daily routine on his own - Held: High Court was right in taking annual income on the basis of ITR - Considering the age of claimant and the fact that he had a steady income, an addition of 50% to the income that he was earning at the time of accident would be justified for determining loss of income - Further, appropriate multiplier would be 17 - The two heads of compensation "future treatment" and "pain and suffering" are distinct and different and cannot be clubbed together, therefore, the two heads are to be severed - Compensation awarded under both heads - High Court's finding as regards compensation under the head 'medical expenses' is maintained - Thus, claimant is awarded enhanced compensation of Rs.19.91 lacs in all.

*Sanjay Verma v. Haryana Roadways*

..... 924

#### NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS ACT, 1881:

s.138, proviso(a) - Dishonour of cheque - Presentation of cheque "within a period of six months from the date on which it is drawn" - Connotation of - Held: The word "month" has been defined u/s 3(35) of General Clauses Act to mean a month reckoned according to the British calendar - Accordingly, period of six months cannot be calculated on 30 days in a month basis - Once the word 'from' is used for the purpose of

(xiv)

commencement of time, in view of s. 9 of General Clauses Act, the day on which the cheque is drawn has to be excluded - Cheque drawn on 31.12.2005 and presented on 30.6.2006 was presented within the period prescribed - Therefore, prosecution is not time barred - General Clauses Act, 1897 - ss.3(35) and 9.

*Rameshchandra Ambalal Joshi v. The State of Gujarat and Anr.*

..... 1112

#### PARTY:

Disparaging remarks against a person not party in a case - Held: When a person is not a party in a case and it is not necessary to decide his conduct in that case then no adverse remark should be made against him - In the instant case, appellant was CM of the State of Haryana - On the basis of complaint from a person in crowd in public meeting, he suspended first respondent from service - In a writ petition by first respondent challenging his suspension, High Court dropped the charges and further, criticized the action of appellant and held that there has been arbitrary exercise of power which was amenable to judicial review - Writ petition could have been decided without making series of comments on appellant, who, at the relevant time, was Chief Minister - Observations made by High Court were really not necessary as an integral part for decision of the case - Therefore, adverse remarks are expunged - Doctrine of audi alteram partem.

*Om Prakash Chautala v. Kanwar Bhan and Others*

..... 939

## PENAL CODE, 1860:

(1) s. 161.

(See under: Sentence/Sentencing) ..... 1063

(2) s.302 IPC and s.27, Arms Act - Murder of a child aged 1 year - Conviction - Death sentence awarded by courts below, keeping in view a large number of criminal cases pending against accused - Held: Prosecution, by evidence of eye witness and medical evidence and FSL report, has successfully proved, cause of death and use of firearm by accused - Findings of trial court as affirmed by High Court that offences u/s. 302 IPC and s.27 of Arms Act have been made out against accused are concurred with - However, sentence of death is converted into one of imprisonment for 20 years without remission, over and above the period already undergone.

*Birju v. State of M.P.* ..... 1047

(3) ss. 302 r/w 120-B, 460 and 382 - Circumstantial evidence - Conviction by courts below - Held: Witness has made material improvements while deposing in court and such evidence cannot be safe to rely upon - Evidence adduced by prosecution to prove second and third circumstances does not pass the test of credibility and is liable to rejection - The recoveries made indicate that the articles recovered were not in exclusive possession of appellants - Further, none of the precaution that ought to have been taken to ensure fair identification of articles recovered was ever taken and no weight can be attached to evidence of identification of property - Both the courts below fell in error in coming to the conclusion

that prosecution has established its case based on circumstantial evidence beyond all reasonable doubt - Benefit of doubt given to both the appellants - Conviction and sentences imposed on them by courts below are set aside and they are acquitted of the charges - Evidence - Circumstantial evidence - Identification - Identification of articles.

*Vijay Kumar v. State of Rajasthan* ..... 1078

(4) s.307 r/w s.34, s.452; s.324 - Attempt to murder - Attack on victim when he was sitting in union office - Trial court found accused guilty u/s.307 r/w s.34 and s.452 - High Court modified conviction u/ s.307 r/w s.34 to s.324 - Held: The plea that the act of strangulating a person by throat by a telephone wire and pulling it from both sides would not attract s.307 cannot be accepted - Even if act does not cause any injury it is punishable with imprisonment up to 10 years - If it does cause an injury and therefore hurt, it is punishable with imprisonment for life - s.307 does not require that the hurt should be grievous or of any particular degree - The intention to cause death is clearly attributable to accused since victim was strangulated after throwing a telephone wire around his neck and telling him that he should die - Further, law protects any house from trespass and protects persons within the house from being assaulted or even put in fear of hurt or wrongful restraint within their own house - There is nothing in s.452 to suggest that the use to which the house is put makes any difference - Accused were not entitled to be acquitted of offences u/s.452 r/w s.34 - Judgment of High Court is set aside and that of

trial court restored.

*Pasupuleti Siva Ramakrishna Rao v. State of A.P. & Ors.* ..... 1139

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION ACT, 1947:  
u/ss. 5(1) (d) r/w s. 5(2).  
(See under: Sentence/Sentencing) ..... 1063

PROBATION OF OFFENDERS ACT, 1958:  
(See under: Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) ..... 1047

PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION:  
(See under: Constitution of India, 1951) ..... 959

RESTROSPECTIVE OPERATION:  
(See under: Legislation) ..... 885

SENTENCE/SENTENCING:  
(1) Death sentence awarded by courts below - Based on criminal antecedents of accused - Held: Death was caused in retaliation to not meeting the demand of accused - It is not a rarest of rare case warranting capital punishment - Prior conviction will be a relevant factor, but in the instant case, accused has only been charge-sheeted and not convicted and, therefore, it is not a relevant factor for applying the RR test so as to award capital punishment - However, it may be relevant factor for awarding a sentence - In the instant case, when there are more than two dozen cases against accused of which three relate to offence of murder and two to attempt to murder, it may have an impact on sentencing policy, since presence of accused could be a continuing threat to society and calls for longer period of incarceration - This is a fit case where 20 years of rigorous imprisonment, without

remission, to appellant, over and above the period which he has already undergone, would be an adequate sentence and will render substantial justice - Criminal law - Motive.

(Also see under: Penal Code, 1860; and Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973).

*Birju v. State of M.P.* ..... 1047

(2) Reducing of sentence to a period less than the minimum prescribed - Conviction u/ss. 5(1) (d) r/w s. 5(2) of 1947 Act and s. 161, IPC - Conviction and sentence of one and half years with fine - Held: Thirty years long delay in the proceedings, three months incarceration, age of accused with ailments and the petty amount of bribe would be special reasons for reducing the substantive sentence - Accordingly, sentence of imprisonment is reduced to the period already undergone and fine enhanced to Rs.50,000/- - Prevention of Corruption Act, 1947 - u/ss. 5(1) (d) r/w s. 5(2) - Penal Code, 1860 - s. 161.

*V.K. Verma v. CBI* ..... 1063

(3) (See under: Constitution of India, 1950) ..... 1093

#### SERVICE LAW:

(1) (i) Misconduct - Unauthorised long absence from duty - Dismissal from service - Reinstatement directed by High Court without back wages - Held: Employee remained unauthorisedly absent for a long time - Medical certificate was filed belatedly - Charges were found proved - High Court has erred in giving emphasis on first time desertion and directing reinstatement - Besides, respondent was a Junior Engineer - Regard being had to his official position, it was expected of him to maintain

discipline, act with responsibility, perform his duty with sincerity and serve the institution with honesty - This kind of conduct cannot be countenanced as it creates a concavity in work culture and ushers indiscipline in an organization - Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply And Sewerage Board Employees (Discipline And Appeal) Regulations, 1978 - Regulations 6(1) and 6(2).

(ii) Proportionality of punishment - Long absence from duty - Dismissal - Held: Doctrine of proportionality in the context of imposition of punishment in service law gets attracted when court on analysis of material brought on record comes to conclusion that punishment imposed by disciplinary authority or appellate authority shocks the conscience of court - Respondent by remaining unauthorisedly absent for such a long period with inadequate reason and in not responding to the communications from employer, had not only shown indiscipline but also made an attempt to get away with it - Such a conduct is not permissible - Doctrine of proportionality does not get remotely attracted to such a case - Punishment is definitely not shockingly disproportionate.

*Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board and others v. T.T. Murali Babu*

..... 987

#### SMUGGLERS AND FOREIGN EXCHANGE MANIPULATORS (FORFEITURE OF PROPERTY) ACT, 1976:

(i) s.6(1) - Notice under - Requirement of recording reasons in the notice - Plea of appellant that notice issued u/s.6 was defective as it did not contain reasons which made competent authority believe

that notice scheduled properties were illegally acquired property - Held: Not sustainable - There is no such express statutory requirement - Secondly, the reasons, though not initially supplied alongwith the notice were subsequently supplied thereby enabling the appellant to effectively meet the case of respondents - Appellant not only filed a rejoinder to the said notice but he was also given a hearing before an order of forfeiture u/s.7 was passed - Further, an order of forfeiture is an appealable order.

(ii) ss.7, 2(2) - Forfeiture of properties - If violative of Art. 20 of the Constitution - Held: Of all the five categories of persons to whom the Act is made applicable, only one category specified u/s.2(2)(a) happens to be of persons who are found guilty of an offence under one of the enactments mentioned therein and convicted - The other four categories of persons to whom the Act is applicable are persons unconnected with any crime or conviction under any law while the category of persons falling u/s.2(2)(b) are persons who are believed by the State to be violators of law - In case of first category, Art. 20 would have no application for the reason, conviction is only a factor by which Parliament chose to identify the persons to whom the Act be made applicable - The Act does not provide for confiscation of properties of all convicts falling u/s.2(2)(a) or detenues falling u/s.2(2)(b).

(iii) s.2(2) - Forfeiture of illegally acquired property - Legality of - Held: There is a public interest in ensuring that persons who cannot establish that they have legitimate sources to acquire the assets held by them do not enjoy such wealth - Such a

deprivation would certainly be consistent with the requirement of Arts. 300A and 14 of the Constitution which prevent the State from arbitrarily depriving a subject of his property - Even otherwise, in view of its inclusion in the IXth Schedule, the Act is immune from attack on the ground that it violates any of the rights guaranteed under Part III of the Constitution by virtue of declaration under Arts.31-B - Constitution of India, 1950 - Arts.14, 31-B, 300A.

*Biswanath Bhattacharya v. Union of India & Others* ..... 885

#### STRICTURES:

(See under: Party) ..... 939

#### URBAN LAND (CEILING AND REGULATION) ACT, 1976:

s.10(3), (4), (5), (6) - Notice issued to appellants-land owners to hand over possession of land in question and in case of failure, authorities would take necessary action for taking possession by application of necessary force - Meanwhile, Act repealed - Notice challenged by land-owners - Held: Nothing to show that land owners had voluntarily surrendered or authorities had taken peaceful or forcible possession of land in question - Facts clearly indicated that only de jure possession was taken by authorities and not de facto possession before coming into force of repeal of the Act - Therefore, it cannot hold on to lands in question, which were legally owned and possessed by land owners - Consequently, notice and subsequent action taken therein in view of repeal of the Act quashed - Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation)

Repeal Act, 1999.

*Gajanan Kamlya Patil v. Addl. Collector & Comp. Auth. & Ors.* ..... 1032

#### URBAN LAND (CEILING AND REGULATION) REPEAL ACT, 1999:

(See under: Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Act, 1976) ..... 1032

#### WORDS AND PHRASES:

Words, 'from' and 'month' as occurring in s.138(a) of Negotiable Instrument Act, 1881 - Connotation of.

*Rameshchandra Ambalal Joshi v. The State of Gujarat and Anr.* ..... 1112

#### WRIT PETITION:

Re-appreciation of evidence - Scope of - Plea that in view of the failure of High Court to examine tenability of order of forfeiture as confirmed by appellate tribunal, matter is required to be remitted to High Court for appropriate consideration - Rejected - Held: In writ petition, except challenging the order of forfeiture on two legal grounds, there was no other ground on which correctness of order of forfeiture was assailed - For the first time in the instant appeal, appellant sought re-appreciation of evidence without even an appropriate pleading in writ petition - Therefore, no reason to remit the matter to High Court.

(Also see under: Smugglers and Foreign Exchange Manipulators (Forfeiture of Property) Act, 1976).

*Biswanath Bhattacharya v. Union of India & Others* ..... 885