ITEM NO.38

SECTION II-C

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) Nos.5978-5979/2017

COURT NO.1

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 11-08-2017 in BA No. 1573/2017 11-08-2017 in BA No. 1574/2017 passed by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi)

SANJAY CHANDRA & ANR.

Petitioner(s)

Respondent(s)

VERSUS

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

(With appln.(s) for exemption from filing certified as well as ordinary plain copy of the impugned order and intervention)

Date : 08-09-2017 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.M. KHANWILKAR HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE D.Y. CHANDRACHUD

For Petitioner(s)	 Mr. Abhimanyu Bhandari, Adv. Mr. Mahesh Agarwal, Adv. Mr. Abhinav Agrawal, Adv. Mr. Rajiv Virmani, Adv. Mr. Gaurav Jain, Adv. Mr. Atul Malhotra, Adv. Ms. Kartika Sharma, Adv. Ms. Unnati Mishra, Adv. Mr. E. C. Agrawala, AOR
For Respondent(s)	Mr. Rana Mukherjee, Sr. Adv. Mr. Rajiv Nanda, Adv. Mr. T.A. Khan, Adv. Mr. B. V. Balaram Das, AOR
	Mr. M.L. Lahoty, Adv. Mr. Paban K. Sharma, Adv.
	Mr. Himanshu Shekhar, Adv. Mr. Anchit Sripad, Adv.
	Mr. Sanjay R. Hegde, Sr. Adv. Mr. Partha Sil, Adv. Mr. Tavish B. Prasad, Adv.
	Mr. Subhau Roy, Adv.

Mr. Balaji Srinivasan, Adv. Ms. Vaishnavi Subrahmanyam, Adv. Mr. Abhishek Bharti, Adv. Ms. Pratiksha Mishra, Adv. Mr. Arunava Mukherjee, Adv. Mr. Varun K. Chopra, Adv. Mr. Awnish Kumar, Adv. Mr. Ruchit D., Adv. Mr. Abhinav Jain, Adv. Mr. Anil Kr. Tandale, Adv. Ms. Rashmi nandakumar, Adv. Ms. Pragya Routry, Adv. Mr. Ashwarya Sinha, Adv. Ms. Ajita Tandon, Adv. Mr. Anant Bhushan, Adv. Ms. Vibha Mahajan Seth, Adv. Ms. Shriya Maini, Adv. Ms. Upasana Nath, Adv. Mr. Kushagra Pandit, Adv. Mr. Rajat N., Adv. Mr. D.K. Sinha, Adv. Ms. Maheravish Rein, Adv. Mr. Manjeet Singh, Adv. Ms. Shamshravish Rein, Adv. Mr. Aldamsh Rein, Adv. Mr. Sunil Kumar Sharma, Adv. Mr. Niraj Sharma, Adv. Mr. Kaustubh Anshuraj, Adv. Mr. Krishna Kumar Singh, Adv. Mr. Vijay Kr. Sharma, Adv. Mr. Narendra Prasad Yadav, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following O R D E R $% \left({{\left({{{\left({{{C_{{\rm{B}}}}} \right)}} \right)}} \right)$

The interlocutory applications for intervention stand allowed.

3

Heard Mr. Abhimanyu Bhandari, learned counsel for the petitioners.

We have been apprised that the F.I.R. from which the present bail application arose, which is pending before the High Court and the prayer for interim bail has been rejected, we had passed an order on 1st September, 2017, directing the petitioners to deposit a sum of Rs.5,00,00,000/- (Rupees five crores only) before the Registry of this Court, which they have already deposited. As on today, а sum of Rs.20,00,00,000/-(Rupees twenty crores only) has been It is agreed that some of the consumers are deposited. interested to take the possession of the flats after due completion and some would like to have their money refunded. Though there are submissions with regard to the allocation of plots, as presently advised, we do not intend to inter into that arena.

We would like to appoint Mr. Pawan Shree Agarwal, learned counsel as Amicus Curiae, who shall file a chart containing details of all the projects wherein the petitioners are involved and the names of the consumers and the amount deposited with the petitioners project wise. That apart, learned Amicus Curiae shall also, in discussion with the learned counsel for the petitioners, find out about the exact amount that is required to be refunded. Be it clarified, if any consumer is desirous of getting flat, he or she shall communicate it to Mr. Pawan Shree Agarwal through a letter supported by an affidavit so that there will be no confusion.

Let the matter be listed on 15th September, 2017.

(Shakti Parkash Sharma) Assistant Registrar

(Chetan Kumar) Court Master