

Serial No.	Date	Order (s) with Signature (s)
1	2	3
	<u>v</u>	BEFORE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. JUSTICE PERMOD KOHLI V.P.(C) No. 11/2009, W.P.(C) No. 12/2009 and CRP No. 01/2009
19.0)2.13 Pre	sent: M/s. K.K. Rai and B. Sharma, Sr. Advocates with S.K. Pandey and N.T. Bhutia, Advocates for the petitioner. M/s. J.B. Pradhan, Addl. Advocate General with Karma Thinlay Namgyal, Govt. Advocate and S.K. Chettri, Asstt. Govt. Advocate for respondent No. 1 & 2. M/s Bhaskar Raj Pradhan, Sr. Advocate with Yangchen D. Gyatso and Jorgay Namkha, Advocates for respondent No. 3.
	~	These three petitions have been filed invoking jurisdiction of this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India notwithstanding the nomenclature indicated in these petitions. 2. The first petition in this series is CRP No. 01/2009, which was directed against the order dated 18.11.2008 passed by the learned District Judge, Special Division-I at Gangtok, Sikkim. Vide the impugned order dated 18.11.2008 certain directions were issued by the Court for regulating the proceedings by the Commission.



Serial No.	Date	Order (s) with Signature (s)
1	2	3
	2	3. The principal grievance of the petitioner in this case is delay in conducting the proceedings before the Commission. 4. The order impugned in this petition was stayed by this Court vide order dated 05.03.2009. The Commission was directed to conduct further cross-examination of the plaintiff No. 3 in the suit, i.e. the petitioner before me, with effect from 16.01.2009 to 25.01.2009. It is the admitted case of the parties that this cross-examination could not be conducted on account of the fact that the petitioner wanted to move this Court in revision petition and in fact the present petition i.e. CRP No. 01/2009 was filed before this Court. Since the proceedings before the Commission did not commence as directed by this Court, the Court was informed about this fact. On consideration of the various contentions of the parties, the trial Court passed order dated 19.02.2009. The relevant part of the order reads as under: "It is accordingly ordered that the plaintiff No. 3 shall bear the actual expenses incurred by the defendants 1 and 2 and the defendant No. 3 for going to Delhi for the cross-examination of the plaintiff No. 3 as follows: (10 for defendants 1 and 2, the expenses incurred by id. Government Advocate Shri 3.K. Chandak for his to and fro Journey from Delhi on 15th and 16th of January, 2009 as claimed by him; (11) For defendant No. 3 the plaintiff shall bear the to and fro Journey expenses of the Id. Advocates and the entire accompanying team;



Case No.....

Serial No.	Date	Order (s) with Signature (s)
1	2	3
		(iii) Plaintiff No. 3 shall also bear the actual expenditure incurred by the defendant No. 3 from the 12 th of January 2009 till the 18 th of January, 2009 for their boarding, lodging and food expenses. Now the date is required to be fixed for cross-examination of the plaintiff No. 3, however, ld. Counsel Shri Norden Tshering Bhutia verbally submits that he is required to contact his clients to take step in the matter and also to seek the availability of the Hon'ble Commissioner. Considered, in the circumstances, time allowed. To: 2/3/09.
		Sd/-
		(Meenakshi M. Rai)
		District Judge, (Special Div-I) (I/C)"
		·
		5. Aggrieved of the above order the petitioner i.e.
	0	plaintiff No. 3 filed W.P.(C) No. 12/2009. This order was
	2	also stayed by this Court on 09.04.2009. Resultantly the
		proceedings before the Commission virtually came to be
	:	stalled. When the trial Court took up the matter on
		02.03.2009 the defendant No. 3 in the suit filed an
•		application for dismissal of the suit for non-payment of the
		cost as ordered by the trial Court earlier on 19.02.2009.
		During the course of hearing the petitioner sought time to
		pay the costs. The Court issued further directions to the
		Commission for further conduct of the cross-examination,
		etc. At the same time the Peshkar of the Court was asked
		to remain present during the proceedings being conducted
		by the Commission at Delhi and the expenses to be
		incurred for the journey and stay of the Peshkar were also
		fastened upon the petitioner vide order dated 02.03.2009.



	日介表の日 第7年5年2年 第7年2日 日本第7日 日本第7日 日本第7日				
errore CLAMF , Th	Case No				
Serial Di	ate Order (s) with Signature (s)				
DELINERATED OF THE TRANSPORT OF T	2 3				
ERIMINATION MAN	This order also became subject matter of challenge before this Court in W.P.(C) No. 11/2009 and stayed on 09.04.2009. 6. The suit in question relates to the Revered Rumtek Monastery situated in the East District of Sikkim. It has been pleaded in the petition that the plaintiff No. 3 in the suit was prevented by the State Government from entering the State of Sikkim. On account of this factor the plaintiffs approached Hon'ble Supreme Court for transfer of the suit and proceedings pending before this Court from the State of Sikkim, being Transfer Petition (Civil) No(s). 191-194 of 2010. Vide order dated 07.11.2012 the Hon'ble Supreme Court directed the transfer of the Civil Suit pending in the Court of learned District Judge, Special Division-II, State of Sikkim at Gangtok to the District Judge, Darjeeling, State of West Bengal. I am informed by the learned counsel for the parties that now suit has been further assigned to the Addl. District Judge, Siliguri, but the learned District Judge, Darjeeling has further stayed the proceedings before the				
Trader of the second of the se	Addl. District Judge, Siliguri and the matter is pending for consideration with the learned District Judge, Darjeeling. On receipt of order of transfer of the matter from the State of Sikkim to the State of West Bengal, the relevant record of the case was transmitted to the Court of learned District				

1 1 1



The state of the s

Case No.....



theorites of the control of the cont

can annibrative hardyners felettiesto 'enighee't 'Bighee't ke			Case No		
Sistemberscher Sistemberstiger Janeschiefer einer Janescher einer Janescher einer Janescher einer	Serial No.	Date	Order (s) with Signature (s)		
The part of the second	1	2 ·	3		
Called Michael S. Park Called Lower S. Park Littles Davin S. Park Littles Davin S. Park Davin 4 (19 park C. P. Carl	1		have been claimed for 10 persons from Bagdogra to New		
officialisms the disset depolarments decounts			Delhi and back. The statement of expenditure indicates		
Amatheathac o while as Amatheathace Amatheathace			engagement of 2 Senior Advocates and 4 Assistants and 4		
Second Sec	•		number of persons representing the defendant No. 3.		
Commence of Linearise Charles Linearise Charles Commence and Commence of Comme			Similarly the boarding and lodging expenses amounting to		
Stephensons stempersons standards standards standards standards standards			Rs.90,987/- have been claimed by the defendant No. 3.		
Longenies Lingtowers Sington etc. Michigan etc.			Learned Senior Advocate appearing for the petitioner has		
Educations un Educations un saucrasice e se saucrasice e			relied upon a Judgment of the Apex Court reported in		
This about its pinetheactur theatheache in the color			(2012) 1 SCC 455 : Sanjeev Kumar Jain vs. Raghuvir		
Control of the contro		7	Saran Charitable Trust and Others to dispute the		
Litte States and the Control of the		`7	quantum of liability. In this case, the Hon'ble Supreme		
AND MENTAL OF THE STREET OF TH			Court was considering the issue of award of costs and		
Sundantin Indiannia 20 40 Ingilitan 10.042			expenses etc. by way of compensatory costs under		
CORRESPONDED IN THE CORRES			Sections 35, 35-A and 35-B of CPC, particularly in Civil		
ENTERNA IN SERVICE IN SERVIC			Suits/ Appeals. It has been observed that the principles		
表现代型10mm est. 证据20mm est. 证据20mm est. 证据20mm est.			enunciated under these provisions which are penal in		
THE STATE OF THE S			nature are strictly applicable to the Civil Suits and Civil		
PARTIES STATE PARTIES STATE THE STATE OF STATE THE STATE	*1		Appeals. The jurisdiction of the High Court in writ petitions		
Description outs Marie essential description Description of the second outside outsi			is different. It further observed that award of costs		
Littliffengite Marjara Ra oct Marjara Ra oct Marjara Lyne Callada Lyne			including compensatory costs i.e. expenses etc. in civil		
CBP45244 (BP45244 -127000000000000000000000000000000000000			matters must be in adherence to Sections 35, 35-A and		
dreiftliering wone Merständigen er wi Merständigen er wi			35-B of CPC. Even though the Hon'ble Supreme Court		
Singularian Singularian Singularian Singularian Singularian			suggested amendment of the Rules to enable the Court to		
SERVICEST SECURETS & PERIODE DI SECURETS DI SECURETS DI TRADESCENTA			award actual expenses as observed in the case of Salem		



Advocates Bar Association [(2009) 2 SCC 656] however, while interpreting the expression "actu expenses" the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as under: "36. We, therefore, suggest that the Rules is amended to provide for "actual realistic costs". To object is to streamline the award of costs and simple the process of assessment, while making the co "actual and realistic". While ascertainment of actual necessary in regard to expenditure incurred (as f example, travel expenses of witnesses, cost of obtaining certified copies, etc.) insofar as advocates free concerned, the emphasis should be on "realistic" with than "actual". The courts are not concerned with the paid to them. For the present, the advocate fee shounds to them. For the present, the advocate fee shounds are allowed to them. For the present, the advocate fee shounds are allowed to the final paragraph (ii) and (iii) of the impugned order date in paragraph (ii) and (iii) of the impugned order date 19.02.2009 in W.P.(C) No. 12/2009 are not sustainable law. Taking the realistic view I direct the journey expension under direction No. (ii) shall be confined for four person i.e. two Senior Advocates, one briefing Advocate and on person on behalf of defendant No. 3. Similarly as against lump sum claim of boarding, lodging and food expenses of Rs.90,987/-, I am of the view that an amount of Rs.50,000/- should be sufficient to compensate the	Serial	Date	Case No
Advocates Bar Association [(2009) 2 SCC 656] however, while interpreting the expression "actu expenses" the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as under: "36. We, therefore, suggest that the Rules i amended to provide for "actual realistic costs". To object is to streamline the award of costs and simplify the process of assessment, while making the co "actual and realistic". While ascertainment of actual necessary in regard to expenditure incurred (as if example, travel expenses of witnesses, cost of obtaining certified copies, etc.) insofar as advocates' fee concerned, the emphasis should be on "realistic" rath than "actual". The courts are not concerned with the number of lawyers engaged or the high rate of day paid to them. For the present, the advocate fee should be a realistic normal single fee." 9. Applying the ratio of the judgment referred to above a realistic normal single fee." 9. Applying the ratio of the judgment referred to above a realistic normal single fee." 1 am of the considered opinion that the direction contained in paragraph (ii) and (iii) of the impugned order date 19.02.2009 in W.P.(C) No. 12/2009 are not sustainable in paragraph (ii) and (iii) of the impugned order date 19.02.2009 in W.P.(C) No. 12/2009 are not sustainable in paragraph (ii) and (iii) shall be confined for four person under direction No. (ii) shall be confined for four person i.e. two Senior Advocates, one briefing Advocate and on person on behalf of defendant No. 3. Similarly as against lump sum claim of boarding, lodging and food expenses of Rs.90,987/-, I am of the view that an amount of Rs.50,000/- should be sufficient to compensate the defendant No. 3. To this extent the impugned order if accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in terms	1	Dale	
however, while interpreting the expression "actual expenses" the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as under: "36. We, therefore, suggest that the Rules I amended to provide for "actual realistic costs". To object is to streamline the award of costs and simplify the process of assessment, while making the confection and realistic". While ascertainment of actual necessary in regard to expenditure incurred (as flexample, travel expenses of witnesses, cost of obtains certified copies, etc.) insofar as advocates' fee concerned, the emphasis should be on "realistic" rath than "actual". The courts are not concerned with the number of lawyers engaged or the high rate of day paid to them. For the present, the advocate fee should be a realistic normal single fee." 9. Applying the ratio of the judgment referred to above I am of the considered opinion that the direction contained in paragraph (ii) and (iii) of the impugned order date 19.02.2009 in W.P.(C) No. 12/2009 are not sustainable in law. Taking the realistic view I direct the journey expense under direction No. (ii) shall be confined for four person i.e. two Senior Advocates, one briefing Advocate and on person on behalf of defendant No. 3. Similarly as against lump sum claim of boarding, lodging and food expenses of Rs.90,987/-, I am of the view that an amount of Rs.50,000/- should be sufficient to compensate the defendant No. 3. To this extent the impugned order is accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in terms.	1	2	
w36. We, therefore, suggest that the Rules I amended to provide for "actual realistic costs". To object is to streamline the award of costs and simpli the process of assessment, while making the co "actual and realistic". While ascertainment of actual necessary in regard to expenditure incurred (as f example, travel expenses of witnesses, cost of obtaining certified copies, etc.) insofar as advocates' fee concerned, the emphasis should be on "realistic" rath than "actual". The courts are not concerned with the number of lawyers engaged or the high rate of day for paid to them. For the present, the advocate fee should be a realistic normal single fee." 9. Applying the ratio of the judgment referred to above I am of the considered opinion that the direction contained in paragraph (ii) and (iii) of the impugned order date 19.02.2009 in W.P.(C) No. 12/2009 are not sustainable if law. Taking the realistic view I direct the journey expension. The contract of the present in the present i			
"36. We, therefore, suggest that the Rules amended to provide for "actual realistic costs". To object is to streamline the award of costs and simplified the process of assessment, while making the conscious and realistic". While ascertainment of actual necessary in regard to expenditure incurred (as fexample, travel expenses of witnesses, cost of obtaining certified copies, etc.) insofar as advocates' fee concerned, the emphasis should be on "realistic" rath than "actual". The courts are not concerned with the number of lawyers engaged or the high rate of day fee paid to them. For the present, the advocate fee shound be a realistic normal single fee." 9. Applying the ratio of the judgment referred to above it am of the considered opinion that the direction contained in paragraph (ii) and (iii) of the impugned order date 19.02.2009 in W.P.(C) No. 12/2009 are not sustainable it law. Taking the realistic view I direct the journey expension under directign No. (ii) shall be confined for four person i.e. two Senior Advocates, one briefing Advocate and on person on behalf of defendant No. 3. Similarly as agains lump sum claim of boarding, lodging and food expenses of Rs.90,987/-, I am of the view that an amount of Rs.50,000/- should be sufficient to compensate the defendant No. 3. To this extent the impugned order is accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in terms			however, while interpreting the expression "actual
amended to provide for "actual realistic costs". To object is to streamline the award of costs and simplication the process of assessment, while making the construction and realistic". While ascertainment of actual necessary in regard to expenditure incurred (as fexample, travel expenses of witnesses, cost of obtains certified copies, etc.) Insofar as advocates' fee concerned, the emphasis should be on "realistic" rath than "actual". The courts are not concerned with the paid to them. For the present, the advocate fee should be a realistic normal single fee." 9. Applying the ratio of the judgment referred to above the arealistic normal single fee." 9. Applying the ratio of the judgment referred to above the arealistic normal single fee." 9. Applying the ratio of the judgment referred to above the arealistic normal single fee." 9. Applying the ratio of the judgment referred to above the arealistic normal single fee." 1 am of the considered opinion that the direction contained in paragraph (ii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the paragraph (iii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated the parag			expenses" the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as under:
I am of the considered opinion that the direction contained in paragraph (ii) and (iii) of the impugned order dated 19.02.2009 in W.P.(C) No. 12/2009 are not sustainable in law. Taking the realistic view I direct the journey expension under direction No. (ii) shall be confined for four person i.e. two Senior Advocates, one briefing Advocate and on person on behalf of defendant No. 3. Similarly as against lump sum claim of boarding, lodging and food expenses of Rs.90,987/-, I am of the view that an amount of Rs.50,000/- should be sufficient to compensate the defendant No. 3. To this extent the impugned order is accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in term		0	object is to streamline the award of costs and simplification the process of assessment, while making the confiactual and realistic. While ascertainment of actual necessary in regard to expenditure incurred (as for example, travel expenses of witnesses, cost of obtaining certified copies, etc.) insofar as advocates fee concerned, the emphasis should be on "realistic" rather than "actual". The courts are not concerned with the number of lawyers engaged or the high rate of day fee paid to them. For the present, the advocate fee should
in paragraph (ii) and (iii) of the impugned order date 19.02.2009 in W.P.(C) No. 12/2009 are not sustainable in law. Taking the realistic view I direct the journey expension under direction No. (ii) shall be confined for four person i.e. two Senior Advocates, one briefing Advocate and on person on behalf of defendant No. 3. Similarly as against lump sum claim of boarding, lodging and food expenses of Rs.90,987/-, I am of the view that an amount of Rs.50,000/- should be sufficient to compensate the defendant No. 3. To this extent the impugned order is accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in term		7	
19.02.2009 in W.P.(C) No. 12/2009 are not sustainable in law. Taking the realistic view I direct the journey expension under direction No. (ii) shall be confined for four person i.e. two Senior Advocates, one briefing Advocate and on person on behalf of defendant No. 3. Similarly as against lump sum claim of boarding, lodging and food expenses of Rs.90,987/-, I am of the view that an amount of Rs.50,000/- should be sufficient to compensate the defendant No. 3. To this extent the impugned order is accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in terms			
law. Taking the realistic view I direct the journey expension under direction No. (ii) shall be confined for four person i.e. two Senior Advocates, one briefing Advocate and on person on behalf of defendant No. 3. Similarly as against lump sum claim of boarding, lodging and food expenses of Rs.90,987/-, I am of the view that an amount of Rs.50,000/- should be sufficient to compensate the defendant No. 3. To this extent the impugned order is accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in term	1		in paragraph (ii) and (iii) of the impugned order date
under direction No. (ii) shall be confined for four person i.e. two Senior Advocates, one briefing Advocate and on person on behalf of defendant No. 3. Similarly as against lump sum claim of boarding, lodging and food expenses of Rs.90,987/-, I am of the view that an amount of Rs.50,000/- should be sufficient to compensate the defendant No. 3. To this extent the impugned order is accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in term			19.02.2009 in W.P.(C) No. 12/2009 are not sustainable i
i.e. two Senior Advocates, one briefing Advocate and one person on behalf of defendant No. 3. Similarly as against lump sum claim of boarding, lodging and food expenses of Rs.90,987/-, I am of the view that an amount of Rs.50,000/- should be sufficient to compensate the defendant No. 3. To this extent the impugned order is accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in term			law. Taking the realistic view I direct the journey expens
person on behalf of defendant No. 3. Similarly as against lump sum claim of boarding, lodging and food expenses of Rs.90,987/-, I am of the view that an amount of Rs.50,000/- should be sufficient to compensate the defendant No. 3. To this extent the impugned order is accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in term			under direction No. (ii) shall be confined for four person
person on behalf of defendant No. 3. Similarly as against lump sum claim of boarding, lodging and food expenses of Rs.90,987/-, I am of the view that an amount of Rs.50,000/- should be sufficient to compensate the defendant No. 3. To this extent the impugned order is accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in term			i.e. two Senior Advocates, one briefing Advocate and on
lump sum claim of boarding, lodging and food expenses of Rs.90,987/-, I am of the view that an amount of Rs.50,000/- should be sufficient to compensate the defendant No. 3. To this extent the impugned order is accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in term			
Rs.90,987/-, I am of the view that an amount of Rs.50,000/- should be sufficient to compensate the defendant No. 3. To this extent the impugned order is accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in term			
Rs.50,000/- should be sufficient to compensate the defendant No. 3. To this extent the impugned order is accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in term			
defendant No. 3. To this extent the impugned order in accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in term			Rs.90,987/-, I am of the view that an amount \mathfrak{c}
accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in term			Rs.50,000/- should be sufficient to compensate th
		٠	defendant No. 3. To this extent the impugned order i
			a condition to the desired. The contents to be seen to
			accordingly modified. The costs to be worked out in term



7

The base of the control of the contr

Case No.....

 $\overline{}$

Serial No.	Date	Order , (s) with Signature (s)
1	2	3
	2	deposited by the petitioner before the trial Court within one month. 10. In CRP No. 01/2009 the directions for further cross-examination by the defendant No. 3 before the Commission are also required to be set aside on account of subsequent event viz. transfer of the suit from the Court of District Judge, Special Division-II, Sikkim at Gangtok to the State of West Bengal. The necessity to issue Commission for cross-examination of defendant No. 3 arose because of the ban imposed by the State of Sikkim against entry of plaintiff No. 3. Now the suit has been transferred to the State of West Bengal, the plaintiff No. 3 can personally appear before the Transferee Court and can be subjected to cross-examination. Thus the direction contained in the impugned order dated 18.11.2008 and order dated 0.2.03.2009 impugned in W.P.(C) No. 11/2009 also needs to be set aside to the extent these orders contain the directions for cross-examination by the Commission at Delhi and further direction for payment of the cost in terms of the order dated 19.02.2009 shall stand set aside having been modified hereinfore. Resultantly it is directed that the plaintiff No. 3 shall now appear before the competent Court where the suit may be transferred for

A STATE OF THE STA



	15. E		Tr.
			9 4 r 4 r
		1	din (
though 21.	(a E\$	1	Case No
21442 224 24 T	Serial No.	Date	Order .(s) with Signature (s)
in the line of the	7,	2	1 formation in 3
er in the r	411. 3	,	further cross-examination as may be directed by the trial
ene interestation et ma interestation et ma in			Court. where the terms of the t
を を を を を を を を を を を を を	**************************************		11. With these observations these petitions stand
newstanister in 1979/ENRIPALEN IE 1979/ENRIPALEN IE	este y a s Parti y Parti y	u A	disposed of # # Park # 2
is wind with a	7/4		12. A copy of this order be kept in the connected files.
ine and a provided			it. Ceeun, C
			Chief Justice 19.02.2013
# च १६ ०३	Index Intern	: Yes / No et : Yes / N	bo 40 ,
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	pm/jk	Ů	7
need 1. Herritation on the Table 1. The	ì p. a		e
der Withing to the tensor of t	iro Yaka	,	1977- 22-1 55-7a. 33 € 54794. 626 - 627-
entendas fr			्या कर _{(B} इ. ४१ १
ns. p Inglikur Sentukur			а ! а
T " Tet" up Ne allera			
			l eg
Leungs Agans A 2-			ያ ቻ ችላ
Э э э	ग.		18.19 € # #
erna _k			
	\$д, н "		t
** **.			•
The second secon			·
K times a	GPG- 1/Co	omp.4/High Court	/ 2000 Nos./25.04.2012

1