

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT CALCUTTA

THE STATE OF BENGAL v. CHANDRA LAL DAS

2. Petition / 12 - 91.

14

Memorandum / 12 - 91.

Additional Solicitor General / 12 - 91.

VS 528

The State of Bihar & others v. Respondents.

THE MEDIATION CLAUSE

1. Application

1. An application under
Section 3 of the Indian
Mediation Act.
4 to 5

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT CALCUTTA

(Civil Appeal No. 1000 of 1971)

Plaintiff _____ / of 101.

v.

Defendant _____ / of 101.

In the matter of an

application for decree S.C.C.O.

under the Indian Limitation Act;

dated _____

In the matter of

Shambhu Nath Sarkar _____

versus A. M. D.

versus

The State of Bihar & others _____ vs. R. P. Mukherjee

So,

The complete justice needs no name, the

complete justice is the high court of Calcutta

at Calcutta and the High Court of Calcutta is the
Supreme Court of Justice.

The Honorable, et al. et al. on behalf
of the appellants above.

Opposition Application:

1. That this I.A. petition on behalf of the appellants most respectfully set forth a motion of delay if at any time filing the Interlocutory patent appeal against the hearing or judgment and order dated 4-7-68 issued in Civil Action No. 1430 of 1968 by Honorable Justice Kevin Burke whereb. as x the Honorable Single Judge has dismissed the writ of certiorari or did not interfere in the termination of a hearing from the post of Assistant Attorney on the ground that his training application was not valid application as it did not have U.S. Patent approval from USPO awards.
2. That the Appellants declare that no one has not earlier filed any such interlocutory application seeking consideration of delay which was being prayed for in this interlocutory application.
3. That the Appellants submit this to the Honorable

of appeal the detail the appellant has pleaded about the genuine facts and circumstances which are not repeated in the instant delay continuation application.

4. That it is submitted that the Ords. of the Hon'ble Single Bench dated 24.7.2012 passed in C. J. No. 10436 of 2012 was not informed within time of a call by advocate concerned. Since the said writ application 118 petitioners were filed jointly with application. Appellant knew about the impugned order in the month of September 2012 and applied for a certify copy of the order dated 24.7.2012 p.c. in C. J. No. 10436 of 2012 on 10.9.2012 and the copy was delivered on 11.9.2012.

5. That it is submitted that after obtaining the certified copy of the order Memo of appeal was drafted and Ltr.A. was filed on which is in time from the date of pronouncement of the order but if it is the date of dismissal of the order it has been filed beyond 30 days so this limitation period is being taken to exclude the delay if any in filing the letters patent appeal.

-4-

6. That in the facts and circumstances of the case as stated about the delay in filing the notice of any be condoned, otherwise the Appellant will suffer legal arrears and injury which can not be compensated in any manner.

It is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that your Lordships may be so graciously pleased to allow this Interlocutory application by condoning the delay of 13 days in filing the Notice against the impugned judgment and order dated 16.7.2012; case no. 17 C.W.J.C. No. 14430 of 2012 by Justice ~~Amarendra~~ Savitri Singh.

And for this,

Pray such other orders or directions as your Lordships may deem fit and proper.

And for this, the petitioner shall ever pray.

A C C L I D A V I F.

I, Sk.Mu.Yusuf Zakaria , aged about 43 years, son of Sk.Ata
Mohamed , resident of village Chsingur,P.O.-Chsingur,District
-Kaimur, do hereby solemnly affirm and state as follows:-

1. That I am appellant of this petition and as such well acquainted with the facts circumstances of the case.
2. That I have gone through the contents of this I.A. petition and understand the same which are true to my knowledge and belief .