
(2015) 02 SC CK 0132

In the Supreme Court Of India

Case No : Writ Petition (s) (Civil) No (s) .235 of 2012 Conmt.Pet. (C) No. 559 of 2014 in W.P. (C) No. 295 of 2012 W.P. (C) No. 295 of 2012 (With Office Report) W.P. (C) No. 580 of 2003 (With Office Report)

Savelife Foundation

APPELLANT

Vs

Union of India

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 13-02-2015

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2016) 7 SCC 194 : (2016) 3 SCCri 133

Hon'ble Judges : Madan B. Lokur and Uday Umesh Lalit, JJ.

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : Ms. Indu Malhotra, Senior Advocate, Ms. Nishtha Kumar and Mr. Kush Chaturvedi, AOR, Advocates, Dr. J.P. Dhanda, AOR, Ms. Raj Rani Dhanda, Mr. Vineet Dhanda, Mr. Krishna Kumar, AOR, Mr. B. Vinodh Kanna and Mr. Prashant Bhushan, Advocates, for the Appellant; Mr. Gaurav Aggarwal, (AC), Ms. Pinky Anand, ASG, Mr. Ashok Kumar Panda, Sr. Advocate, Ms. Sadhana Sandhu, Mr. S.S. Rawat, Ms. Sunita Sharma, Mr. R.R. Rajesh, Mr. D.S. Mahra, Mrs. Anil Katiyar, Chhattisgarh Mr. C.D. Singh, AAG, Mr. Daman Hajela, Maharashtra Mrs. Asha Gopalan Nair, Mr. A.P. Mayee, Nagaland Mrs. K. Enatoli Sema, Mr. Amit Kumar Singh, Mr. Balaji Srinivasan, Tamil Nadu Mr. B. Balaji, Mr. R. Rakesh Sharma, Ms. R. Shase, Adv. A&N Mr. K.V. Jagdishvaran, Mrs. G. Indira, Mr. Ravindra Keshavrao Adsure, Mr. Tara Chandra Sharma, Mr. Sanjay R. Hegde, Mr. B. Krishna Prasad, Mr. V.G. Pragasam and Mr. Anip Sachthey, Advocates, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

Writ Petition (C) No.235 of 2012 (Savelife Foundation & Anr. v. UOI & Anr.)

1. Application seeking extension of time for three months for compliance of the order dated 29.10.2014 is allowed.

2. The Central Government should finalise the guidelines positively on or before 15th May, 2015.

List Writ Petition (C) No.235 of 2012 on 15th May, 2015.

W.P.(C) No. 295/2012 (Dr. S. Rajaseekaran v. Union of India & Others)

3. Learned Amicus Curiae has submitted a brief note in which he has pointed out that this Court may consider issuing some directions. One of the directions is that the State of Maharashtra should respond to the questionnaire sent by the Committee on Road Safety without any further delay.

4. We are surprised that the State of Maharashtra has not yet responded to the questionnaire sent by the Committee. Learned Standing Counsel submits that she will take up the matter with the State Government. Whatever may be, the State of Maharashtra should respond one way or the other to the questionnaire sent by the Committee within two weeks and we direct accordingly.

5. Secondly, with regard to the letter dated 23rd December, 2014 sent by the Committee, we are told by learned Amicus Curiae that not even a single State has responded to this letter. The Committee has required the State Governments to express their views with regard to the measures proposed in the aforesaid letter. The State Governments should at least submit their views in response to the aforesaid letter so that the Committee can make further progress in the matter. The time for giving a response expires on 28th February, 2015.

6. The States, including the State of Maharashtra, must give their views to the Committee, one way or the other, before 28th February, 2015.

List W.P.(C) No. 295/2012 on 27th March, 2015.

W.P.(C) No. 580/2003 (Common Cause v. Union of India & Ors.)

7. Since the issue raised in this petition is more or less the same as in W.P.(C) No. 295/2012 (Dr. S. Rajaseekaran v. Union of India & Others), we are of the opinion that no further purpose would be served in continuing with this petition.

8. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of.

9. However, learned counsel for the petitioner can make submissions in W.P.(C) No.295/2012 through learned Amicus Curiae.

Conmt.Pet.(C) No. 559/2014 In W.P.(C) No. 295/2012

10. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the contempt petition.

11. Leave granted.

12. The contempt petition is dismissed as withdrawn in terms of the signed order.