

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) NO. _____ OF 2020
(UNDER ARTICLE 136 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA)
With prayer for interim relief

POSITION OF PARTIES

BETWEEN	IN HIGH COURT	IN THIS COURT
Smt. Rajshree	Nil	Petitioner
Aged ___ years		
W/o _____		
Residing at		
Belgaum		
Karnataka		

AND

- | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|
| 1. State of Karnataka,
Vidhan Soudha,
Bangalore-560001
Represented by its Chief Secretary | Respondent No 1 | Respondent No1 |
| 2. Karnataka Secondary Education board
Department of Personnel &
Administrative Reforms,
Government of Karnataka, | Respondent No 2 | Respondent No. 2 |

Vidhan Soudha,

Bangalore- 560 001

Represented by its Principal Secretary

To,

The Hon'ble Chief Justice of India

And His Companion Judges of the

Supreme Court of India, New Delhi

The Special Leave Petition of the
above named Petitioner

TO,

THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE OF INDIA AND HIS COMPANION
JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA THE HUMBLE
PETITION OF THE PETITIONERS ABOVENAMED

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH

1. The present petition is being brought against the order dated 27.5.2020 passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka at Bangalore in WP No. 7201 / 2020 by which the Hon'ble High Court refused to intervene to cancel the Class 10 SSLC Board in Karnataka in light of the COVID-19 pandemic and the high risk to the health and lives of lakhs of minor students that it will impact. The class 10 SSLS Board exams are announced to be held from 25th June 2020 to 4th July 2020 exams and close to 8,48,000 students will be appearing

for these exams in the State. The Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate that having 8,48,000 children and their parents / guardians and the thousands of staff travel and gather in more than 3000 examination centres all over Karnataka where each centre will have not less than 500 people, will be serious health risk even with the Standard Operating Procedure and guidelines in place and will violate the right to life and health of minor students, which can be protected by promoting them based on their internal assessment marks taken by the school, as many other States have done.

1A. No LPA or writ appeal lies against the impugned order.

2. QUESTIONS OF LAW:

The following questions of law arise for consideration by this Hon'ble Court:

- i) **WHETHER** the Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate that holding of the Class 10 SSLC Board exams during the present COVID-19 pandemic will amount to putting the lives of all the students at a serious risk of contracting the corona virus, thus violating the right to life within includes the right to health under Article 21 of the constitution and therefore deserves the intervention of this Hon'ble Court?
- ii) **WHETHER** the Hon'ble High Court erred in reaching a conclusion that a writ court should be slow to interfere in academic matters, and failing to consider that the Respondent State government had taken the decision to hold the Class 10

board exams which would pose the biggest risk to the lives and health of more than 8.48 lakhs children due to the high risk of COVID-19 infections? Whether the interference of constitutional courts even in academic matters is warranted in the face of a violation of the constitutional rights of minor students who would be made to travel in impossible conditions, and participate in the Board exams with hundreds of people at a single centre and no facilities of testing for COVID-19 and even when students show symptoms of the illness, they would be made to write the exams in a separate room, and such guidelines would be a clear violation of the right to life and health of students which would warrant interference in academic matters?

iii) **WHETHER** the Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate that the Standard Operating Procedure contained in the Circular issued by the Respondent State government providing for basic provision of masks, sanitisation and seating of students would not be able to guarantee that students coming for the exams will not be infected with the COVID-19 and in fact be exposed to the high risk of infections as the entire exam process will involve the travelling of more than 25-30 lakh people in the State, many coming from within containment zones and being in crowded buses and transport facilities, in examination centres where not less than 500 people would be present and physical distancing would not be possible, thus

risking the lives of thousands of students and violating their fundamental rights under Article 21 of the constitution?

- iv) **WHETHER** the Hon'ble High Court erred in holding that the safeguards laid down in the Standard Operating Procedure by the Respondent State Government were adequate even when the SOP stated that there would be two students sitting on a single bench (as per the diagram), if any students were to be found having symptoms of COVID-19, they would not be sent for testing or treatment, but would be made to write the exams in a separate room, thus allowing the infection to spread and that the requirements for physical distancing would be impossible to be complied with when there are 500-700 people at each examination centre?
- v) **WHETHER** the Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate that the action of the Respondent State Government to give the option of doing the Board exams after two months to migrant children who cannot return to Karnataka for the exams and to children in containment zones, makes the entire process of conducting the Board exams on June 25th infructuous and redundant as it would lead to a majority of students who may not be migrant or not living in containment zones to also take that option, as they may not be mentally prepared to give the exams due to the lockdown and health pandemic?

vi) **WHETHER** the Hon'ble High Court on the one hand held that it is the duty of the Respondents to ensure that the children who are going to appear for the Class 10 SSLC Board examination are not exposed to any danger, it failed to appreciate that by allowing the examinations to go on and asking children to appear for the exams, it would amount to directly exposing them to danger and risk to their health and lives and would amount to a violation of Article 21 which guarantees the right to life and health?

vii) **WHETHER** the Hon'ble High Court in not cancelling the Class X SSLC Board exams failed to appreciate that as held by this Hon'ble Court in ***Consumer Education & Research vs Union Of India & Others, 1995 SCC (3) 42*** that the right to health and medical care is a fundamental right under Article 21 read with Articles 39(c), 41 and 43 of the Constitution and the Right to life includes protection of the health and strength of a person which is a minimum requirement to enable a person to live with human dignity. The State is enjoined to take all such action which will promote health of its people and denial thereof denudes a person the right to life violating Article 21. In allowing the Class X exams to go on during this COVID-19 pandemic, exposing more than 8.48 lakh children to travel to the examination centres and be exposed to large crowds of 500 to 700 persons at each examination centre for more than 10 days, would be a complete denial of the right to health of the students this was ignored in the impugned judgement?

viii) **WHETHER** the Hon'ble High Court erred in holding that the safeguards laid down by the Respondent State Government were sufficient to prevent any health risks to minor children, without examining what preparation the Respondent State Government had made to even implement its Standard Operating Procedure? Without examining if the Respondent State Government had identified enough examination centres which would enable the accommodation of 500 students with the physical distancing norms, the provisions of masks and sanitisation equipment and the transport which would also take into account physical distancing, and the training of teachers and non-teaching staff to maintain distancing, merely having the Standard Operating Protocol would not suffice as the same would not be effectively implemented, thus putting the lives of lakhs of children at risk?

ix) **WHETHER** the directions given by the Hon'ble High Court that children from containment zones and migrant children be given the option of appearing for the supplementary exams two months later and that they should not lose their academic year are vague, impossible to be implemented and would amount to children who opt for supplementary exams being discriminated as they would lose out on college and pre-university class admissions for Class 11? With no directions given to college and university authorities for delaying the

academic year for 2020-2021, all classes for standard 11 in Karnataka would start in July 2020, and students who give the supplementary exams would not be able to get admission for this academic year and would lose the year and thus be discriminated and in violation of their fundamental right to equal treatment under Article 14 of the constitution?

- x) **WHETHER** the Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate that all students in Class X under the SSLC Board had undergone internal assessments over the entire academic year in the form of Formative test-1, Formative Test-2, Mid Term examinations and Formative Test-3 and 4. There have been preparatory and pre-board examinations also already conducted by the respective schools and they have got the performance report of the each student. Therefore on the basis of these tests conducted by the each and every school the average aggregate marks can be assessed and result can be declared. These performance details are already uploaded to the Department of Education by respective Schools.
- xi) **WHETHER** the Hon;ble High Court failed to consider that several other State Governments such as Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Haryana and Maharashtra, have in light of the COVID-19 health risks cancelled the entire Class 10 board exams or the remaining subjects for which exams were not conducted and decided to promote the students based on the internal assessments, which can be done by the Respondents,

keeping the right to life and health of the children guaranteed under Article 21 of the constitution in mind?

- xii) **WHETHER** the Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate that the right to education for children as guaranteed under Article 21 and Article 21 A of the constitution, means an education and assessment procedures that protect the child and the child's life with dignity. Whether by allowing the examinations to go on in the instant case in light to the several health risks of COVID-19, the action of the Hon'ble High Court is in violation of the rulings of this Hon'ble Court in ***Society for Unaided Private Schools v. State of Rajasthan*** _____ where it was held that Article 21A contemplates that the right to education is child centric and not institution centric and that all other fundamental rights in Part III would be dependent upon right to life in Article 21 as interpreted by this Court to include right to live with dignity and the right to education?
- xiii) **WHETHER** the Hon'ble Court failed to appreciate that such examinations which violate the safety of minor students would violate their right to life which this Hon'ble Court in ***Mohini Jain v. State of Karnataka*** (1992) 3 SCC 666 held that the right to education is a fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution to protect the dignity of individuals?
- xiv) **WHETHER** the Hon'ble High Court also failed to appreciate that the Respondent State government has a positive obligation under Article 47 of the constitution to raise the

standard of living and to improve public health and conducting these public examinations in the time COVID -19 when the infections all over the country are still on the rise, would expose 25-30 lakhs of people who are all involved in the exams including students, their guardians, staff, police and health care workers at risk of their health and in the obligation of improvement of public health such a step cannot be taken?

3. DECLARATION IN TERMS OF RULE 4(2)

The Petitioner states that no other petition has been filed by her against the impugned judgment and order dated 27.5.2020 passed in Writ Petition No. 7201 of 2020

4. DECLARATION IN TERMS OF RULE 6:

The Annexures P/1 to P/_____ produced along with the Special Leave Petition are true copies of the pleadings/documents, which formed part of the records of the case in the High Court below against whose order, the leave to appeal is sought for in this petition.

5. GROUND:

The following grounds are submitted:

- (i) **THAT** the Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate that holding of the Class 10 SSLC Board exams during the present COVID-19 pandemic will amount to putting the lives of all the students at a serious risk of contracting the corona virus, thus violating the right to life within includes the right to health under Article

21 of the constitution and therefore deserves the intervention of this Hon'ble Court.

xv) THAT the Hon'ble High Court erred in reaching a conclusion that a writ court should be slow to interfere in academic matters, and failing to consider that the Respondent State government had taken the decision to hold the Class 10 board exams which would pose the biggest risk to the lives and health of more than 8.48 lakhs children due to the high risk of COVID-19 infections. The interference of constitutional courts in academic matters is warranted in the face of a violation of the constitutional rights of minor students who would be made to travel in impossible conditions, and participate in the Board exams with hundreds of people at a single centre and no facilities of testing for COVID-19. Even when students show symptoms of the illness, they would be made to write the exams in a separate room, and such guidelines would be a clear violation of the right to life and health of students which would warrant interference in academic matters.

xvi) THAT the Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate that the Standard Operating Procedure contained in the Circular issued by the Respondent State government providing for basic provision of masks, sanitisation and seating of students would not be able to guarantee that students coming for the exams will not be infected with the COVID-19 and in fact be exposed to the high risk of infections as the entire exam

process will involve the travelling of more than 25-30 lakh people in the State, many coming from within containment zones and being in crowded buses and transport facilities, in examination centres where not less than 500 people would be present and physical distancing would not be possible, thus risking the lives of thousands of students and violating their fundamental rights under Article 21 of the constitution.

xvii) THAT the Hon'ble High Court erred in holding that the safeguards laid down in the Standard Operating Procedure by the Respondent State Government were adequate even when the SOP stated that there would be two students sitting on a single bench (as per the diagram), if any students were to be found having symptoms of COVID-19, they would not be sent for testing or treatment, but would be made to write the exams in a separate room, thus allowing the infection to spread and that the requirements for physical distancing would be impossible to be complied with when there are 500-700 people at each examination centre.

xviii) THAT the Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate that the action of the Respondent State Government to give the option of doing the Board exams after two months to migrant children who cannot return to Karnataka for the exams and to children in containment zones, makes the entire process of conducting the Board exams on June 25th infructuous and redundant as it would lead to a majority of students who may not be migrant

or not living in containment zones to also take that option, as they may not be mentally prepared to give the exams due to the lockdown and health pandemic.

xix) **THAT** the Hon'ble High Court on the one hand held that it is the duty of the Respondents to ensure that the children who are going to appear for the Class 10 SSLC Board examination are not exposed to any danger, it failed to appreciate that by allowing the examinations to go on and asking children to appear for the exams, it would amount to directly exposing them to danger and risk to their health and lives and would amount to a violation of Article 21 which guarantees the right to life and health.

xx) **THAT** the Hon'ble High Court in not cancelling the Class X SSLC Board exams failed to appreciate that as held by this Hon'ble Court in ***Consumer Education & Research vs Union Of India & Others, 1995 SCC (3) 42*** that the right to health and medical care is a fundamental right under Article 21 read with Articles 39(c), 41 and 43 of the Constitution and the Right to life includes protection of the health and strength of a person which is a minimum requirement to enable a person to live with human dignity. The State is enjoined to take all such action which will promote health of its people and denial thereof denudes a person the right to life violating Article 21. In allowing the Class X exams to go on during this COVID-19 pandemic, exposing more than 8.48 lakh children to travel to the examination centres and be exposed to large crowds of

500 to 700 persons at each examination centre for more than 10 days, would be a complete denial of the right to health of the students this was ignored in the impugned judgement.

xxi) **THAT** the Hon'ble High Court erred in holding that the safeguards laid down by the Respondent State Government were sufficient to prevent any health risks to minor children, without examining what preparation the Respondent State Government had made to even implement its Standard Operating Procedure? Without examining if the Respondent State Government had identified enough examination centres which would enable the accommodation of 500 students with the physical distancing norms, the provisions of masks and sanitisation equipment and the transport which would also take into account physical distancing, and the training of teachers and non-teaching staff to maintain distancing, merely having the Standard Operating Protocol would not suffice as the same would not be effectively implemented, thus putting the lives of lakhs of children at risk.

xxii) **THAT** the directions given by the Hon'ble High Court that children from containment zones and migrant children be given the option of appearing for the supplementary exams two months later and that they should not lose their academic year are vague, impossible to be implemented and would amount to children who opt for supplementary exams being discriminated as they would lose out on college and pre-

university class admissions for Class 11? With no directions given to college and university authorities for delaying the academic year for 2020-2021, all classes for standard 11 in Karnataka would start in July 2020, and students who give the supplementary exams would not be able to get admission for this academic year and would lose the year and thus be discriminated and in violation of their fundamental right to equal treatment under Article 14 of the constitution.

- xxiii) **THAT** the Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate that all students in Class X under the SSLC Board had undergone internal assessments over the entire academic year in the form of Formative test-1, Formative Test-2, Mid Term examinations and Formative Test-3 and 4. There have been preparatory and pre-board examinations also already conducted by the respective schools and they have got the performance report of the each student. Therefore on the basis of these tests conducted by the each and every school the average aggregate marks can be assessed and result can be declared. These performance details are already uploaded to the Department of Education by respective Schools.
- xxiv) **THAT** the Hon;ble High Court failed to consider that several other State Governments such as Madhya Pradesh, Punjab, Haryana and Maharashtra, have in light of the COVID-19 health risks cancelled the entire Class 10 board exams or the remaining subjects for which exams were not conducted and decided to promote the students based on the internal

assessments, which can be done by the Respondents, keeping the right to life and health of the children guaranteed under Article 21 of the constitution in mind.

xxv) **THAT** the Hon'ble High Court failed to appreciate that the right to education for children as guaranteed under Article 21 and Article 21 A of the constitution, means an education and assessment procedures that protect the child and the child's life with dignity. Whether by allowing the examinations to go on in the instant case in light to the several health risks of COVID-19, the action of the Hon'ble High Court is in violation of the rulings of this Hon'ble Court in ***Society for Unaided Private Schools v. State of Rajasthan*** _____ where it was held that Article 21A contemplates that the right to education is child centric and not institution centric and that all other fundamental rights in Part III would be dependent upon right to life in Article 21 as interpreted by this Court to include right to live with dignity and the right to education.

xxvi) **THAT** the Hon'ble Court failed to appreciate that such examinations which violate the safety of minor students would violate their right to life which this Hon'ble Court in ***Mohini Jain v. State of Karnataka*** (1992) 3 SCC 666 held that the right to education is a fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution to protect the dignity of individuals.

xxvii) **THAT** the Hon'ble High Court also failed to appreciate that the Respondent State government has a positive obligation under

Article 47 of the constitution to raise the standard of living and to improve public health and conducting these public examinations in the time COVID -19 when the infections all over the country are still on the rise, would expose 25-30 lakhs of people who are all involved in the exams including students, their guardians, staff, police and health care workers at risk of their health and in the obligation of improvement of public health such a step cannot be taken.

(ii) **GROUND FOR INTERIM RELIEF**

It is submitted that pending disposal of this petition, unless the ensuing exams which are proposed to be held from June 25th 2020 to 4th July 2020 are stayed, it would render this entire petition infructuous. If they are not stayed, then children would be severely affected as they would start making arrangements to travel thus putting themselves at risk and this would also put the lives of their guardians and parents at risk.

(iii) **MAIN PRAYER:**

It is therefore prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to:-

- A. Grant special leave to appeal against the impugned final judgment and order dated 27.05.2020 passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in W.P. No.7201/2020 and;
- B. Pass orders directing that the Class 10 SSLC (Karnataka Secondary School Examination Board) Board Exams in Karnataka, scheduled to take place from 25th June 2020 to 4th July 2020 should not be held in light of the COVID-19 pandemic in the country and direct that all students of Class 10 under the

SSLC board be assessed for promotion to the next class on the basis of the internal assessments, pre-board and preparatory examinations; and

C. Grant costs of this Petition, and

D. Pass such other and further orders that this Hon'ble Court may deem fit in the interest of justice.

(iv) INTERIM RELIEF:

Pass a direction staying the Class 10 SSLC Board Exams in Karnataka, scheduled to take place from 25th June 2020 to 4th July 2020 and pass any such further order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice and equity.

FILED BY:

SETTLED BY:

Jayna Kothari
Senior Advocate
DRAWN ON

FILED ON

ADVOCATE-ON-RECORD
FOR THE PETITIONER

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

S.L.P.(CIVIL) NO. OF 2020

IN THE MATTER OF:-

Smt. Rajshree

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Karnataka & Ors.

.....Respondents

CERTIFICATE

CERTIFIED that the Special Leave Petition is confined only to the pleadings before the Court whose order is challenged and the other documents relied upon in those proceedings. No additional facts, documents or grounds have been taken therein or relied upon in the Special Leave Petition. It is further certified that the copies of the documents/Annexures attached to the Special Leave Petition are necessary to answer the questions of law raised in the petition or make out the grounds urged in the Special Leave Petition for consideration of this Hon'ble Court. This certificate is given by the Petitioner/person authorized by the petitioner whose affidavit is filed in support of the Special Leave Petition.

NEW DELHI

DATED

ADVOCATE-ON-RECORD
FOR PETITIONER

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

Civil Appellate Jurisdiction

(Under Article 136 of the Constitution of India)

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) NO. OF 2020

WITH PRAYER FOR INTERIM RELIEF

(From the impugned final judgment & order dated

27.5.2020 passed by the High Court of Karnataka at Bangalore in Writ
Petition No. 7201 of 2020)

In the matter of:

Smt. Rajshree

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Karnataka & Ors.

.....Respondents

PAPER BOOK

(FOR INDEX KINDLY SEE INSIDE)

ADVOCATE FOR PETITIONER:

**LISTING PROFORMA
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA**

1.Nature of the matter

Civil

2.Name(s) of
Petitioner(s)/Appellant(s)

3.Name(s) of Respondent(s)

4.Number of case

5.Advocate(s) for Petitioner(s)

6.Advocate(s) for Respondent (s)

7.Section dealing with the matter.

XVI

8.Date of the impugned order/judgment 27.06.2020

8A Name of Hon'ble Judges: Chief Justice Abhay Sreenivas Oka and J. P. Krishna Bhat

8B. In Land Acquisition Matters :

i) Notification/Govt. Order No. u/s. 4,6)..... N.A.
dated.....issued by Centre/State of.....
ii) Exact purpose of acquisition & village involved.....

8C. In Civil Matters :- N.A.

(i) Suit No., Name of Lower Court.....
Date of Judgment.....

8D.In Writ Petitions:- N.A.
“Catchword” of other similar matters.....

8E.In case of Motor Vehicle Accident Matters : N.A.
Vehicle No.

8F. In Service Matters N.A.
(i) Relevant service rule, if any.....W.B.S.R. (Pt 1) Rule 21.....
(ii) G.O./Circular/Notification, if applicable or in question.....
N.A.

8G In Labour Industrial Disputes Matters : N.A.
I.D. Reference/Award No., if applicable

9. Nature of urgency Petitioner is a retired senior citizen

10.In case it is a Tax matter : N.A.
a) Tax amount involved in the matter.....
b) Whether a reference/statement of the case was called for or rejected.....
c) Whether similar tax matters of same parties filed earlier (may be for earlier/other Assessment Year)?
d) Exemption Notification/Circular No.....

11.Valuation of the matter N.A.

12.Classification of the matter:

No. of Subject Category with full name. 06 Service Matters
No. of sub-category with full name. 0612 Equal pay for equal work

13.Title of the Act involved (Centre/State).. Constitution of India

14.(a) Sub-Classification (indicate Section/Article of the Statute) 226

- (b) Sub-Section involved. N.A.
(c) Title of the Rules involved (Centre/State N.A.
(d) Sub-classification (indicate Rule/Sub-rule of the Statute) N.A.

15. Point of law and question of law raised in the case Whether the petitioner is entitled to equal pay for equal work and pay protection.

16. Whether matter is not to be listed before any Hon'ble Judge? N.A.
Mention the name of the Hon'ble Judge.....

17. Particulars of identical/similar cases, if any N.A.
a) Pending cases:
b) Decided cases with citation.....

17A. Was SLP/Appeal/Writ filed against same impugned Judgment/order earlier? If yes, particulars NO

18. Whether the petition is against interlocutory/ final order/decree in the case
Final order

19. If it is a fresh matter, please state the name of the High Court and the Coram in the impugned Judgment/Order:
High Court at Calcutta
J. Amit Talukdar & J. Prabuddha Sankar Banerjee

20. If the matter was already listed in this Court : N.A.
a) When was it listed? N.A.
b) What was the Coram? N.A.
c) What was the direction of the Court..... N.A.

21. Whether a date has already been fixed either by Court or on being mentioned for the hearing of matter? If so, please indicate the date fixed...
.....NA.

22. Is there a caveat? If so, whether a notice has been issued to him?.....

23. Whether date entered in the Computer?.....

24. If it is a criminal matter, please state :
a) Whether accused has surrendered. N.A..
b) Nature of offence, i.e. convicted under Section with Act: N.A.
c) Sentence awarded.... N.A.
d) Sentence already undergone by the accused N.A.

e) (i) FIR/RC/etc.

Date of Registration of FIR etc

Name & place of the Police Station.

N.A.

(ii) Name & place of Trial Court.

N.A.

Case No. in Trial Court and Date of Judgment.

N.A.

(iii) Name and place of 1st Appellate Court.

N.A.

Case No. in 1st Appellate Court & date of Judgment.

N.A.

Date .06.2020

Anindita Pujari

Advocate for Petitioner

C.C _____

Mobile No. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
S.L.P.(CIVIL) NO. OF 2020

IN THE MATTER OF:-

Smt. Rajshree

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Karnataka and Others

.....Respondents

OFFICE REPORT ON LIMITATION

1. The petition is/are within time.
2. The petition is barred by time and there is a delay of ____ days in filing the same against order dated _____ and petition for condonation of ____ days delay has been filed.
3. There is a delay of ____ days in re-filing the petition and petition for condonation of ____ days delay in re-filing has been filed.

New Delhi

Branch Officer

Dated

INDEX

1. Office Report on Limitation A
2. Listing proforma A1-A2
3. Check List A3-A5
4. Synopsis and list of Dates B -
5. Copy of impugned judgment & order dated
_____ passed by the High Court of Karnataka in W.P No. ____ of

6. Special Leave petition with affidavit
7. ANNEXURE – P/1:
8. ANNEXURE – P/2:
9. ANNEXURE – P/3:
10. ANNEXURE – P/4:
11. ANNEXURE – P/5:
12. ANNEXURE – P/6:
13. ANNEXURE – P/7
14. ANNEXURE– P/8:
15. ANNEXURE – P/9:

NEW DELHI

DATED

ADVOCATE-ON-RECORD
FOR PETITIONER