

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SIKKIM

CIVIL JURISDICTION

WP(PIL)

28

12

No.....of 20.....

SUJATA SUBBA

~~/Appellants/s/~~
Petitioner (s)

Versus

STATE OF SIKKIM AND ORS.

Respondent (s)
~~/Opposite party/s/~~

~~Appellant~~
For
Petitioner
(Advocate (s))

MR. A.K.UPADHYAYA, SR. ADVOCATE WITH
MS. BINITA CHHETRI AND MS. DAWA J. SHERPA


Respondent
For
~~Opposite Party~~
(Advocate (s))

MR. J.B. PRADHAN, ADDL. ADVOCATE GENERAL WITH
MR. KARMA THINLAY, GOVT. ADVOCATE AND
MR. S.K. CHETTRI, ASSTT. GOVT. ADVOCATE.

Serial No.	Date	Order (s) with Signature (s)
1	2	3
01.	05.07.12	<p>Present: Mr. A.K. Upadhyaya, Sr. Advocate with Ms. Binita Chhetri and Ms. Dawa Jangmu Sherpa, Advocates for the Petitioner.</p> <p>Mr. Karma Thinlay Namgyal, Govt. Advocate and Mr. S.K. Chettri, Asstt. Govt. Advocate, for the State-respondents.</p> <p>...</p>



Case No.....

Serial No.	Date	Orders (s) with Signature (s)
1	2	3
		<p>In view of the prayer made in the writ petition, notice is being issued only to respondent No. 3. Mr. Karma Thinlay Namgyal, learned Govt. Advocate accepts notice.</p> <p>Apart from various other reliefs sought, one of the prayers made in the petition is that the respondent No. 3 who is seized to complaint filed by the petitioner has failed to decide the same. The complaint was made before the respondent No. 3 regarding the category certificate granted to respondent No. 4 on 16.07.2011. It is further submitted that the hearing was conducted on 28.03.2012, but till date no decision has been taken.</p> <p>In view of the above circumstances, this petition is disposed of without going into merit of the controversy, with the direction to respondent No. 3 to dispose of the complaint within a period of one month in accordance with law.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"> Chief Justice 05.07.2012</p>

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
pm/jk