

A

MANINDERJIT SINGH BITTA

v.

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

(Writ Petition (C) No. 510 of 2005)

B

FEBRUARY 7, 2012

[S.H. KAPADIA, CJI, A.K. PATNAIK AND SWATANTER
KUMAR, JJ.]

C

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT, 1988:

D

E

F

ss. 41(6) and 109(3) - High Security Registration Plates (HSRP) Scheme - Implementation of - Held: Installation of HSRP is a statutory command which is not only in the interest of the security of State, but also serves a much larger public interest - Therefore, it is not only desirable, but mandatory, for every State Government and Union Territory to comply with the statutory provisions/orders of Supreme Court in terms of Art. 129 of the Constitution of India - All State Governments and Union Territories, therefore, are mandated to fully implement the scheme of fixation of HSRP in their entire territories, positively within the time specified - The orders of the Court are expected to be implemented without default and with a sense of urgency - Further, directions issued as regards costs for non-compliance with the orders of the Court - As regards unwarranted conduct and wilful disobedience of orders of the Court by the State concerned, notice to issue as directed in the judgment - Constitution of India, 1950 - Art. 129 - Contempt of Court - Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989 - r.5 - Costs.

G

In the case of Association of Registration Plates¹ the challenge made to the provisions of the Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989 the statutory order of the Central Government and the terms and conditions of the tender process with

1. 2004 (6) Suppl. SCR 496 = 2005 (1) SCC 679.

H

respect to implementation of the High Security Registration Plates (HSRP) Scheme was rejected by the Supreme Court. The Court also issued certain directions for appropriate implementation of the Scheme. However, persistent default and non-compliance by different State Governments and Union territories with regard to implementation of the scheme and the orders passed by the Supreme Court resulted in filing of the instant writ petition. The Court passed orders on 30.8.2011, 13.10.2011 and 8.12.2011, directing the defaulter State Governments and Union territories to implement HSRP Scheme within the specific time frame and file affidavits and undertakings. Non-Compliance of the said orders led to filing of contempt petitions and IAs. Despite specific orders of the Court, some of the State Governments and Union Territories failed to file the requisite affidavits and undertakings.

Disposing of Writ Petition No. 510 of 2005, IAs and Contempt Petitions filed therein, and remitting the other matters back, the Court

HELD: 1.1 Installation of HSRP is a statutory command which is not only in the interest of the security of State, but also serves a much larger public interest. Therefore, it is not only desirable, but mandatory, for every State to comply with the statutory provisions/orders of this Court in terms of Art. 129 of the Constitution of India, 1950. All states, therefore, are mandated to fully implement the scheme of fixation of HSRP in their entire State, positively within the time specified by 30.4.2012 in relation to new vehicles, and 15.6.2012 for old vehicles. [para 11(c)] [885-H; 886-A-C]

1.2 The States of Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim, Uttarakhand and Union Territory of Andaman & Nicobar Islands have, by and large, implemented the scheme and have commenced the

A program for fixation of HSRPs in their respective States. The Court appreciates the effort put by these states and would direct that they should complete the entire program in all respects before 30-4-2012. [para 10] [885-B-C]

B 1.3 It is emphasized that the Court's time is spent on these cases, that too, at the cost of regular cases pending before it. The orders of the Court are expected to be implemented without default and with a sense of urgency. In the interest of justice and by way of last opportunity, the period for filing of the affidavits and/or undertakings is extended by two weeks, subject to payment of Rs. 10,000/- as costs by each State concerned. Costs for non-compliance with the directions of this Court, shall be paid by the State Governments at the first instance. The Court is of the considered view that the instant cases are not such where the Court should permit the public exchequer to be burdened by payment of costs. In fact, the costs paid should be recovered from erring or defaulting officers/officials. [para 9 and 18] [884-F-H; 885-A; 888-D-E]

F 1.4 The directions contained in the earlier judgments of this Court and more particularly, the orders dated 30.8.2011, 13.10.2011, 8.12.2011, and the instant order should be implemented within the extended period without default. In the event of default, the Secretary (Transport)/ Commissioner, State Transport Authority and/or any other person or authority responsible for such default shall be liable to be proceeded against under the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971. [para 11(d) and (e)] [886-D-E]

H 2. The Court notices the unwarranted conduct and wilful disobedience of the orders of this Court by the State of Andhra Pradesh. This State was found to be a defaulter even in the earlier orders passed by this Court.

Despite specific directions contained in the order dated 30.8.2011, the affidavits filed on behalf of the said State do not even remotely suggest that any steps have been taken by the State for implementing the scheme of HSRP in compliance with the directions issued by this Court. The conduct and behaviour of the State administration has undermined the authority of this Court as well as the dignity of justice. Consequently, notice be issued to the Principal Secretary (Transport, Roads and Building Department), Andhra Pradesh and the Transport Commissioner, State of Andhra Pradesh to show cause, why they be not punished in accordance with the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act for violating the orders of this Court. [para 13-15] [886-H; 887-F-G]

3. All the files that had been summoned by this Court for ensuring the complete implementation of the scheme shall revert back to the respective courts for their disposal in accordance with law. The High Courts concerned would deal with such matters on priority keeping in view the directions and orders of this Court. [para 21] [889-B-C]

Association of Registration Plates v. Union of India (2004) 5 SCC 364; *Association of Registration Plates v. Union of India* 2004 (6) Suppl. SCR 496 = (2005) 1 SCC 679; and *Maninderjit Singh Bitta v. Union of India* (2008) 7 SCC 328 - referred to.

Case Law Reference:

(2004) 5 SCC 364	referred to	para 2
2004 (6) Suppl. SCR 496	referred to	para 2
(2008) 7 SCC 328	referred to	para 3

CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION : Writ Petition (Civil) No. 510 of 2005.

A

WITH

SLP (C) Nos. 24497, 13485 of 13630-13631 2011 & 1894-1897 of 2012

AND

B

Writ Petition (C) No. 162 of 2010.

A. Mariarputham AG, Ashok H. Desai, Mukul Rohatgi, Harish N. Salve, Bhaskar Raj Pradhanm, Uday U. Lalit, T.S. Doabia, Brijender Chahar, R. Sundaravardhan, K.T.S. Tulsi, C.S. Rajan, P.N. Misram AAG. V. Madhukar, Manjit Singh, Dr. Manish Singhvi, Pradhuman Gohil, Vikash Singh, S. Hari Haran, Taruna Singh, Ajay Bansal, Charu Mathur, Arunabh Chowdhury, Anupam Lal Das, Gainilung Panmei, Raktim Gogoi, Vaibhav Tomar, Parthiv Goswami, Vikas Singh, S Hari Haran, Sunil Fernandes, S. Wasim A. Qadri, Gunwant Dara, Zaid Ali, Manpreet Singh Doabia, A. Deb Kumar, Anil Katiyar, B. Krishna Prasad, Sunita Sharma, S.S. Rawat, Rohitash S. Nagar, D.S. Mahra, Aruna Mathur, Yusuf Khan, Arputham, Aruna & Co., Preetesh Kapur, Hematika Wahi, V.G. Pragasam, S. Prabu Ramasubramanian, S.J. Aristotle, Vanita C. Giri, Krishnanand Pandeya, Sanjay R. Hegde, Radha Shyam Jena, Aruneshwar Gupta, Ranjan Mukherjee, S. Bowmick, S.C. Ghosh, R.P. Yadav, B.S. Banthia, Pradeep Purohit, Anip Sachethey, Mohit Paul, Shagun Matta, Avijit Bhattacharjee, K.N. Madhusoodhanan, R. Sathish, Gopal Singh, Rudreshwar Singh, Rituraj Biswas, Rajesh Srivastava, Asha G. Nair, Anitha Bafna, Ramesh Babu M.R., B.V. Balaram Das, D. Bharathi Reddy, Kamini Jaiswal, Arun K. Sinha, Vikas Mehta, T.V. George, Anitha Shenoy, A. Subhashini, Khwairakpam Nobin Singh, Sapam Biswajit Metei, Ratan Kumar Choudhuri, Bharmajeet Mishra, Navnit Kumar, Vartika Sahay (for Corporate Law Group), Priyanka Agarwal, Zaid Ali, Kuber Boddh, Jatinder Kumar Bhatia, Anil Srivastav, Rituraj Biswas, Sudhir Walia, Jatinder Kumar Bhatia, Bina Madhavan, G. Prakash, R.K. Gupta, Rajeev Dubey, Kamlendra Mishra, S. Prasad, Shweta Majumdar, Atul Jha, Sandeep Jha, D.K. Sinha, Manmeet

MANINDERJIT SINGH BITTA v. UNION OF INDIA & 879
ORS.

Arora, Kuldip Singh, Tarjit Singh, Kamal Mohan Gupta, K. Enatoli Sema, Amit Kumar Singh, Edward Belho, Nimshim Vashum, Lhusisato Iralu, Balaji Srinivasan, D.K. Devesh, Irshad Ahmad, Asutosh Singh, Milind umar, T. Harish Kumar, P. Prasanth, G.N. Reddy, C. Kannan, Ravi Shankar, S. Chandra Shekhar, Manoj Kumar, Krishanu Adhikary, Astha Sharma, Naresh Bakshi, Rachna Gupta, Himinder Lal, Abhijit Sengupta, Rachana Srivastava, D.P. Singh, Shuchita Srivastava, Sonam Gupta, Vinay Arora, Sanjay Jain, Suresh Chandra Tripathy, Jagjit Singh Chhabra for the appearing parties.

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

SWATANTER KUMAR, J. 1. The Government of India, on 28th March, 2001, issued a notification under the provisions of Section 41(6) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (for short, 'the Act') read with Rule 50 of the Motor Vehicles Rules, 1989 (for short, 'the Rules') for implementation of the provisions of the Act. This notification sought to introduce a new scheme regulating issuance and fixation of High Security Number Plates. In terms of sub-section (3) of Section 109 of the Act, the Central Government issued an order dated 22nd August, 2001 which dealt with various facets of manufacture, supply and fixation of new High Security Registration Plates (hereinafter, 'HSRP'). The Central Government also issued a notification dated 16th October, 2001 for further implementation of the said order and the HSRP scheme. Various States had invited tenders in order to implement this scheme.

2. A writ petition being Writ Petition (C) No.41 of 2003 was filed in this Court challenging the Central Government's power to issue such notification as well as the terms and conditions of the tender process. In addition to the above writ petition before this Court, various other writ petitions were filed in different High Courts raising the same challenge. These writ petitions came to be transferred to this Court. All the transferred cases along with Writ Petition (C) No. 41 of 2003 were referred to a larger Bench of three Judges of this Court, by order of reference dated 26th May, 2005 in the case of *Association of*

A *Registration Plates v. Union of India* [(2004) 5 SCC 364], as
there was a difference of opinion between the learned Members
of the Bench dealing with the case. The three Judge Bench
finally disposed of the writ petitions vide its order dated 30th
November, 2004 reported in *Association of Registration Plates*
B *v. Union of India* [(2005) 1 SCC 679]. While dismissing the
writ petition and the connected matters, this Court rejected the
challenge made to the provisions of the Rules, statutory order
issued by the Central Government and the tender conditions
and also issued certain directions for appropriate
C implementation of the scheme.

3. The matter did not rest there. Persistent default and non-
compliance by the different States with regard to the statutory
Rules, implementation of the schemes as well as the orders
passed by this Court resulted in filing of the present writ petition
D being Writ Petition (C) No.510 of 2005. This writ petition also
came to be disposed of by a three Judge Bench of this Court
vide its judgment dated 8th May, 2008 titled as *Maninderjit*
Singh Bitta v. Union of India [(2008) 7 SCC 328]. It will be
appropriate to refer to the operative part of the said judgment:

E “5. Grievance of the petitioner and the intervener i.e. All
India Motor Vehicles Security Association is that
subsequent to the judgment the scheme of HSRP is yet
not implemented in any State except the State of
Meghalaya and other States are still repeating the
F processing of the tender. The prayer therefore is that the
purpose of introducing the scheme should be fulfilled (sic-
in) letter and spirit. The objective being public safety and
security there should not be any lethargy. It is pointed out
that most of the States floated the tenders and thereafter
G without any reason the process has been slowed down...

XXX

XXX

XXX

9. Needless to say the scheme appears to have been
introduced keeping in view the public safety and security
H of the citizens. Let necessary decisions be taken, if not

already taken, within a period of six months from today. While taking the decision the aspects highlighted by this Court in the earlier decision needless to say shall be kept in view.”

4. Despite the above judgment of this Court, most of the States have failed to implement the scheme and the directions contained in the judgments of this Court. The matter remained pending before this Court for a considerable time and various orders passed by this Court directing implementation of the scheme were not complied with. On 7th April, 2011, by a detailed order, we had taken note of the intervening events and the fact that a large number of States had not even implemented the scheme and the directions contained in the judgments of this Court. Before invoking the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court for initiation of contempt proceedings against the concerned authorities of the respective defaulting States, this Court considered it necessary to only require the presence of officers in Court and provided them with another opportunity to ensure compliance of the directions issued by this Court. Despite assurance of an effective implementation of the Court's orders, nothing substantial was done within the time of six weeks, granted by this Court vide its Order dated 7th April, 2011. Certain Interim Applications (I.A.s) were filed by some of the States for extension of time and in view of the assurance given in court, this Court had also dispensed with the personal appearance of the senior officers of those State Governments. However, with some regret, we noticed that still a few states had not complied with the directions of this Court and the casual attitude of the State Government of these States was obvious from their very conduct, inside and outside the Court. This attitude compelled us to pass a very detailed Order on 30th August, 2011, classifying the States into different categories. The first category of the States had taken steps and even awarded the contract for supplying HSRP. The second category was of the States/U.T.s which had not followed the correct procedure for selection and had approved all private vendors,

A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H

A with 'Type Approval Certificate' (TAC) from the Central
 Government, to affix the 'HSRP' at their own premises or at the
 Office of the RTO. The third category was of the defaulting
 States who had filed affidavits, assuring the Court of taking
 steps and finalising the tender allotment within the specified
 B dates. On the basis of the affidavits filed by them, they were
 granted further time and were required to file affidavits of
 compliance. The last category was of the States which had
 been persisting with the default and had not taken any effective
 steps to comply with the directions of this Court. Thus, vide
 C Order dated 30th August 2011 we had passed the following
 directions in relation to this category :

“9. From the record before us, it is clear that there is
 apparent and intentional default on the part of the
 concerned officers of these defaulting States.
 D Consequently, we issue notice to show cause why
 proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 be
 not initiated, if found guilty, why they be not punished in
 accordance with law and why exemplary costs, personally
 recoverable from the erring officers/officials, be not
 E imposed. Notice shall be issued to:

Secretary (Transport) of the defaulting States.

b. Commissioner, State Transport Authority of the
 F respective States.”

5. Despite the above orders, a number of States failed to
 comply with the Court's directions as well as implement the
 provisions of the Act. In these circumstances, the Court was
 satisfied that there being willful violation of the orders of the
 G Court, the default tantamount to contempt of Court.

6. Vide order dated 13th October, 2011, the Court while
 dealing with I.A. No. 10 of 2011, besides issuing certain
 directions, also punished the officers of the defaulting State by
 H imposing a fine of Rs. 2,000/- each and even imposed

exemplary cost of Rs. 50,000/- on the State of Haryana, since it had failed to take any steps in furtherance to the previous order. The matter remained pending, the States were directed to invite tenders and sign agreements with the successful bidders in accordance with the Rules and to complete the work of affixation of HSRP in their entire State/Union Territory. Thereafter, this Court again passed a very detailed order dealing with the circumstance of each State on 8th December, 2011. All these orders, i.e., the Orders dated 30th August, 2011, 13th October, 2011 and 8th December, 2011 should be read as integral part of this final order.

A
B
C

7. In the Order dated 8th December, 2011, we had directed the States to file affidavits of compliance and undertakings that the implementation of the scheme and the provisions of the Act, read in conjunction with the orders of this Court, shall be completed within the specified timeframe. The undertakings were to be filed within four weeks from 25th November, 2011. Another significant direction contained in that order was that all the States, except some of the States, i.e., States of Assam, Chhattisgarh, Haryana, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Punjab, Uttarakhand and Union Territory of Lakshadweep, should complete the implementation of the scheme by 31st March, 2012. States of Himachal Pradesh and Nagaland were granted further time for completing the implementation of the scheme in relation to old vehicles only upto 15th June, 2012.

D
E
F

8. Despite specific orders of the Court, the States of Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Chhattisgarh, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, West Bengal and Union Territory of Lakshadweep have failed to file the requisite affidavits and undertakings within the time granted. The learned counsel for some of these states justified the non-filing of the affidavit on different grounds like that the Registry of the Court was closed for winter vacations on the date when the period of four weeks for filing affidavit expired. This is factually incorrect inasmuch as the period of

G
H

A four weeks would expire on 24th December, 2011 as per our order dated 8th December, 2011. Though the Supreme Court closed for winter vacation on 18th December, 2011, the Registry was opened till 25th December, 2011. Therefore, nothing prevented these States/Union Territories from filing affidavits/undertakings within the stipulated time i.e. 24th December, 2011. Secondly, the process of tenders had not been finalized by the States for one reason or the other and, therefore, they considered it unnecessary to file affidavits required by the Court's Order. We find these excuses without any substance. It was known to everybody as to when the Court was going to close and the affidavits could have been filed well in advance to 24th December, 2011. Even if the affidavits were not accepted on the re-opening of the Court after vacations, the counsel should have mentioned the matter before the Court, which was not done. The affidavits were to be filed stating what steps have been taken by the respective States and undertaking was to be given for compliance with the orders of the Court for implementation within the stipulated time. Both these steps were not dependant upon the completion of the tender process or other difficulties. The parties could have nevertheless filed applications, which, admittedly was not done. Therefore, we find that all these States have acted irresponsibly and with callousness.

9. It should be clearly understood by the hierarchy of the State as well as the learned counsel appearing for the respective States that the Court's time is spent on these cases, that too, at the cost of regular cases pending in the Court. The orders of the Court are expected to be implemented by the officers of the Government and the learned counsel appearing for the parties without default and with a sense of urgency. Though, we find no reason to grant further time to these states as no justifiable ground has been stated before us, however, in the interest of justice and by way of last opportunity, we extend the period for filing of such affidavits and/or undertakings by two weeks from today, on pronouncement of this order. It

shall be subject to payment of Rs. 10,000/- as costs by each State to the Supreme Court Legal Services Committee, costs being conditional. A

10. There are States which have, by and large, implemented the scheme and have commenced the program for fixation of HSRPs in their respective States. These States are Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Mizoram, Nagaland, Sikkim, Uttarakhand and Union Territory of Andaman & Nicobar Islands. We appreciate the effort put by these states and would direct that they should complete the entire program in all respects before 30th April, 2012 in their respective States. B C

11. In furtherance to our order dated 8th December, 2011, learned Registrar, Judicial-II, has submitted his Report pointing out that some of the states have not filed affidavits/undertakings. They have not taken effective steps for implementation of the scheme, in discharge of their statutory obligation and in compliance with the orders of the Court as well. Having perused the Report of the Registrar and the affidavits filed on behalf of different states, we issue the following directions:- D

(a) All States which have invited tenders, have completed the process of finalizing the successful bidder and issued the Letter of Intent, but have not yet signed agreements with the successful bidder, shall sign such agreements within four weeks from today. These States are Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Haryana, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Punjab, Tripura and Uttar Pradesh. E F

(b) The States which have so far not even finalized the tender process, they should do so, again, within four weeks from today. Amongst others these States and Union Territories are Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, Chandigarh, Delhi (NCT) and Puducherry. G

(c) Installation of HSRP is a statutory command which H

A is not only in the interest of the security of State, but
 also serves a much larger public interest. Therefore,
 it is not only desirable, but mandatory, for every
 State to comply with the statutory provisions/orders
 of this Court in terms of Article 129 of the
 B Constitution of India, 1950. All states, therefore, are
 mandated to fully implement the scheme of fixation
 of HSRP in their entire state, positively by 30th
 April, 2012, in relation to new vehicles and 15th
 C June, 2012 for old vehicles. We make it clear that
 they shall not be allowed any further extension of
 time for implementation of this direction.

(d) The directions contained in the earlier judgments of
 this Court and more particularly, the orders dated
 D 30th August, 2011, 13th October, 2011, 8th
 December, 2011 and this order, should be
 implemented within the extended period without
 default.

(e) In the event of default, concerned Secretary
 E (Transport)/Commissioner, State Transport
 Authority and/or any other person or authority
 responsible for such default shall be liable to be
 proceeded against under the provisions of the
 Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

F 12. We grant liberty to the petitioner and/or any other
 person to take out contempt proceedings, if now there is any
 non-compliance of the orders of this Court and the statutory duty
 imposed upon the authorities concerned with regard to
 implementation and completion of the scheme and process of
 G fixation of HSRP, in any State/Union Territory.

13. We cannot help but to notice the unwarranted conduct
 and willful disobedience of the orders of this Court by the State
 of Andhra Pradesh. This State was found to be a defaulter even
 H in the earlier orders passed by this Court. In furtherance to our

order dated 8th December, 2011, an affidavit on behalf of the State was filed on 2nd January, 2012, in this Court. This affidavit has been filed by the Secretary (Transport), Government of Andhra Pradesh. This State had not even initiated any action or process to implement the scheme, as directed under the orders of this Court. To shirk its responsibility, it has been stated in this affidavit that after passing of the order of this Court dated 8th December, 2011, the Government of Andhra Pradesh reviewed the issue and issued an amendment to its original Government Order dated 8th March, 2011. Vide its Government Order dated 24th December, 2011, the Government entrusted the work of implementation of the HSRP in the State of Andhra Pradesh to the Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport Corporation. Strangely, the affidavit further claims that the scheme of HSRP is being implemented according to the direction issued by this Court. Still another affidavit was filed by the Transport Commissioner of the State of Andhra Pradesh on identical lines.

14. These affidavits or even the affidavits filed earlier on behalf of the State of Andhra Pradesh do not even remotely suggest that any steps had been taken by the State for implementing the scheme of HSRP in compliance with the directions issued by this Court. We are unable to appreciate this attitude of the State administration, with which they have persisted, despite specific directions contained in the Order dated 30th August, 2011 and even in the earlier orders passed by this Court. Their conduct and behaviour has undermined the authority of this Court as well as the dignity of justice.

15. Consequently, we issue notice to show cause to Smt. D.Lakshmi Parthasarathy, Principal Secretary (Transport, Roads and Building Department), Andhra Pradesh and Shri Hiralal Samaria, Transport Commissioner, State of Andhra Pradesh to show cause, why they be not punished in accordance with the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act for violating the orders of this Court.

16. The Registry shall maintain a separate file for the

A contempt proceedings initiated against these defaulting officers of Andhra Pradesh.

17. The State of West Bengal filed its affidavit (dated 12th May, 2011) of partial implementation in two districts only, on 24th May, 2011. Thereafter, no affidavit has been filed on behalf of this State. Despite orders of the Court dated 30th August, 2011, 13th September, 2011, 8th December, 2011 and this order, they have failed to file affidavit placing correct facts in regard to the further implementation of the scheme before this Court. In these circumstances and by way of last opportunity, we permit the Secretary (Transport)/ Commissioner, State Transport Authority, West Bengal to file their respective affidavits within two weeks from today subject to payment of Rs.10,000/- as costs.

18. Wherever we have imposed costs for non-compliance with the directions of this Court, the same shall be paid by the State Governments at the first instance. We are of the considered view that the present cases are not the ones where the Court should permit the public exchequer to be burdened by payment of costs. In fact, the costs paid should be recovered from erring or defaulting officers/officials.

19. The State of Arunachal Pradesh is again a State which has neither filed undertaking nor affidavit in terms of the orders of this Court. The learned counsel appearing for the State, however, submitted that they have already started the process and would be able to complete the implementation of the scheme within three months. According to the learned counsel, their predicament was that the successful tenderers had refused to deposit the requisite security amount as contemplated under the terms and conditions of the contract. Be that as it may, we have already granted extension of time, and we therefore, direct the State of Arunachal Pradesh now to implement the orders of this Court without fail within the time granted and subject to payment of Rs. 10,000/- as costs.

20. We make it clear that this order shall dispose of the

writ petition.

A

21. All the files that had been summoned by this Court for ensuring the complete implementation of the scheme shall now revert back to the respective courts for their disposal in accordance with law. Some of the learned counsel appearing for the parties before us had argued that because of certain directions passed by the Courts concerned in these ongoing cases, the concerned States may not be able to finally implement the scheme within the time bound schedule. We request the concerned High Courts to deal with such matters on priority keeping in view the afore-stated directions and orders. We further give liberty to the parties whose petitions are pending before this Court to make a mention before the concerned Bench for expeditious disposal. We have no doubt in our mind that such request of the petitioners would be examined on its own merits by the Hon'ble Judges in the larger interest of national security.

B

C

D

22. Since all aspects of this matter stand finally concluded vide our orders dated 30th August, 2011, 13th October, 2011 and 8th December, 2011 and ultimately by this Order, we see no reason to keep this petition pending on the Board of this Court.

E

23. Consequently, all I.As., contempt petitions in Writ Petition No. 510 of 2005 and Writ Petition (Civil) No. 510 of 2005 stand finally disposed of with no order as to costs.

F

24. However, SLP(C) No. 24497 of 2011, SLP(C) No. 13485 of 2011, Writ Petition (Civil) No. 162 of 2010, SLP(C) Nos. 13630-13631 of 2011 and SLP(C) No. 1894-1897 of 2012 shall now revert back to their respective Courts.

25. Application for impleadment as respondent filed by Ms. Shimnit Utsch India Pvt. Ltd., one of the successful tenderers in the matter relating to State of Maharashtra stands dismissed in view of this final order.

G

R.P.

Matters disposed of.

H