



International Environmental  
Law Research Centre

W.P. (C) No.50 OF 1998

ITEM No.303

Court No. 1

SECTION PIL

# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Writ Petition (Civil) No(s).50/1998

BHOPAL GAS PEEDITH MAHILA U.SANGAT.&ORS

Petitioner (s)

Versus

U.O.I. & ORS

Respondent (s)

*This paper can be downloaded in PDF format from IELRC's website at  
<http://www.ielrc.org/content/c0504.pdf>*

(With Appln(s). for directions and exemption from filing O.T. and impleading party and directions and stay/direction and Office Report )

( For Final Disposal )

Date: 25.04.2005 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.N. SRIKRISHNA

For Petitioner (s) Mr. S. Muralidhar, Adv.

For Respondent (s) Mr. T.S. Doabia, Sr. Adv,  
Ms. Sunita Sharma, Adv  
Ms. Rekha Pandey, Adv.  
Ms. Sushma Suri, Adv  
Mr. D.S. Mahra, Adv.  
Mrs Anil Katiyar, Adv.

For State of M.P. & Applicant in I.A.No.6 Mr. V.R. Reddy, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Sakesh Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. S.K. Agnihotri, Adv.  
  
Mr. P.P. Malhotra, ASG  
Mr. Rajiv Dutta, Sr. Adv. (NP)  
Mr. S. Wasim A Quadri, Adv  
Mr. B.K. Prasad, Adv.

For Applicant in IA 8/05

Mr. Naveen R. Nath, Adv.  
Mrs. Lalit Mohini Bhat, Adv.  
Ms. Anitha Shenoy, Adv.  
Ms. Hetu Arora, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

## O R D E R

Mr. S. Muralidhar, the learned counsel for the petitioners in the main petition, invites our attention to the communication dated 14th March 2005 from the Monitoring Committee and presses for certain directions in the light of paragraph 7 of the Report which reads as under:

“In the end it is also pointed that according to the Honourable Supreme Court’s order proper logistic support is to be provided by the Medical Education Department, which in their view seems to mean only an office space and a part time Hindi Steno. We feel that looking at the nature and load of work an adequate support e.g. an office assistant, a peon for reaching letters etc. to various addresses and a conveyance which can be used for surprise inspections off and on, is the minimum necessity.”

Mr. V.R. Reddy, the learned senior counsel appearing for the State of Madhya Pradesh assures that the State Government would look into the matter and take care of redeeming the grievances pointed out at the earliest. In view of that statement no direction is called for at least for the present.

(AJAY K. JAIN)

(RAJESH DHAM)

COURT MASTER

COURT MASTER

ITEM No.302

Court No. 1

SECTION IV

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A

## **RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

I.A.No.52-53 in Civil Appeal No.3187-88 of 1988

UNION CARBIDE CORPN. LTD.

Appellant (s)

Versus

UNION OF INDIA Respondent (s)

(for extension of time for disbursal of pro-rata compensation)

Date: 25.4.2005 These applications were called on for hearing today.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVARAJ V. PATIL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.N. SRIKRISHNA

For Petitioner(s): M/s J.B. Dadachanji & Co., Advs. (N.P.)

For Respondent(s): Mr. T.S. Doabia, Sr. Adv

For Applicants: Mr. S. Wasim A. Quadri, Adv.

Mr. Varuna Bhandari, Adv.

Mr. V.K. Verma, Adv.

Mr. B.K. Prasad, Adv.

Ms. Sushma Suri, Adv.

Mr. D.S. Mahra, Adv.

Mr. Naveen R. Nath, Adv.

Mrs. Lalit Mohini Bhat, Adv.

Ms. Anitha Shenoy, Adv.

Ms. Hetu Arora, Adv.

Mr. V.R. Reddy, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Sakesh Kumar, Adv.

Mr. S.K. Agnihotri, Adv.

Mr. S. Muralidhar, Adv

Mr. Arun K. Sinha, Adv

Mr.S.B. Upadhyay, Adv. (NP)

Mr. Prashant Bhushan, Adv. (NP)

Mr. Harish Uppal, Adv. (NP)

Mr. A. Mariarputham, Adv

Mr. K.J. John, Adv

Ms. Indu Goswamy, Adv. (NP)

Mr. Mridula Ray Bharadwaj, Adv. (NP)

Mr. H.S. Parihar, Adv. (NP)

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

#### O R D E R

The applications are allowed. The time for submitting the final report regarding completion of pro-rata disbursement and after completing the process of disbursal of pro-rata compensation amongst the claimants, is extended by one year from May 1, 2005.

A quarterly status report may be sent during the year commencing on May 1, 2005.

With regard to the general problems faced by the claimants, they may make a representation to the Registrar which, we see no reason why the same would not receive a sympathetic consideration.

The I.As stand disposed of.

(AJAY K. JAIN)

COURT MASTER

(RAJESH DHAM)

COURT MASTER

