in the written statement as already fixed by the said Court. However, it shall not proceed to hear any other matter till the disposal of this revision.

As mentioned above, let the revision be listed for final hearing before this Court on 1.2.1988.

C.C. be given to both the parties on payment of necessary charges.

Sd-/
Dated: 21.1.1988 JUDGE

ORDER

Shri Rajendra Singh with Shri Shukla for the defendant-applicant.

The case was taken up for verifying from the counsel for defendant-applicant whether it would be necessary to refer to the original record of the trial Court during the course of final hearing of the case fixed for 1.2.1988.

The counsel for the defendant-applicant has assured that copies of all the relevant papers would be made available at the hearing of the case and it is not necessary to send for the original record of the case.

The counsel agrees to the case being listed at serial no. 1 in the hearing (sic) parties cases fixed before this Court on 1.2.1988. Accordingly, the office is directed to list the case for further hearing before this Court on 1.2.1988 at 11 A.M.

Sd-/
Dated: 30.1.1988 JUDGE

ORDER

Parties as before.

Shri Nariman completes his counter reply.

On the question whether any directions can be given by this Court to the trial Court for the expeditious disposal of the suit, counsel for both the parties pray for time.

As agreed to by both (sic) them, further hearing of the case is adjourned to 17.2.1988.

Sd-/
Dated: 5.2.1988 JUDGE

ORDER

Parties as before.

During the course of arguments on earlier dates, this Court had requested the learned counsel for the parties to address it on the point that assuming an order of interim payment was not sustainable under the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure as to why the said order could not be held sustainable under the substantive law of Torts. This Court had also desired to hear the learned counsel for the parties on the point as to why suitable interim directions could not be given by it to the trial Court in this revision with a view to ensure expeditious disposal of the suit.

Shri Parasaran, Attorney General opens his arguments on the abovesaid points and addresses this Court at length on them. His arguments not completed.

It may be mentioned that Shri Umesh Trivedi, Advocate, submitted written submission on behalf of another intervener. A copy of the said written submission has been furnished to the counsel for the defendant-applicant.

Put up for further hearing on 18.2.1988.

Sd-/ JUDGE

ORDER

Parties as before.

Dated: 17.2.1988

Shri Parasaran, Attorney General, concludes his arguments on the two points mentioned in the order-sheet dated 17.2.1988.

Shri Nariman, counsel for the defendant-applicant, begins his reply to the said arguments and addresses this Court at length on them. His reply not completed. Put up for further hearing on 19.2.1988.

Sd-/
Dated: 18.2.1988 JUDGE

ORDER

Parties as before.

Shri Nariman concludes his reply on the two points mentioned in the ordersheet dated 17.2.1988. Shri Parasaran, Attorney General, too completes his short counter reply to the reply of Shri Nariman.

Arguments in the case are closed and the case is fixed for order on 7.3.1988. It is but proper that the operation of the impugned order dated 17.12.1987 directing the defendant-applicant to deposit three thousand five hundred million rupees within two months from the date of the said order is kept stayed till then. It is ordered accordingly.

It may be mentioned that during the pendency of this revision, both the parties submitted paper-books containing copies of the relevant papers on the record of the trial Court and the same were referred to by them during the course of their arguments. They also handed over copies of these paper-books to each other. The paper-books submitted by the parties are taken on record of this case.

For final order on 7.3.1988.

Sd-/
Dated: 19.2.1988 JUDGE

ORDER

As desired by this Court during the course of the hearing, the plaintiff-Union of India has submitted on 23.2.1988 photo copies of the Charter of the defendant-U.C.C. and the Memorandum of Articles of Association of the Union Carbide