HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH : JABALPUR
LARGER BENCH - I (Time 10:30 AM)

Daily Cause List dated : 16-12-2024

BEFORE: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK AGARWAL & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SANJAY DWIVEDI & HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VISHAL DHAGAT

Court Hall No.: 1

NOTE:- All the Advocates are requested to submit a list of cases, in which compromise/amicable settlement is possible in the forthcoming permanent & continuous Lok Adalat. The list of cases may be submitted in the office of M.P. High Court Legal Services Committee, Jabalpur or may also be sent through email mphclsc@gmail.com,sechclscjbp@mp.gov.in at the earliest.

In compliance of Court order dated 28.05.2024 passed in CRA 10947/2019 (Ram Singh Vs State of MP), it is to inform that Counsels cannot appear in Criminal Appeals on the basis of memo of appearance and they will have to necessarily file Vakalatnama. They may do so during the vacation, failing which, after vacation Hon'\ble Court may not entertain appearance on the memo of appearance

MOTION HEARING

[DIRECTION MATTERS]

SN	Case No	Petitioner / Respondent	Petitioner/Respondent Advocate
1	**WP 09623/2021**	NITIN ENTERPRISES	AMIT MISHRA
		Versus	
		THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH ***& Ors.***	MANOJ MUNSHI[R-3], LUCKY JAIN[R-3], ANKIT MORE[R-3], PRACHI JAIN[R-3], VIKRAM MALVIYA[R-3], SHANTANU SHARMA[R-4], KARN SINGH PARIHAR[R-4], SIDDHARTH SHARMA[R-4], PRANAY SHUKLA[R-4][R-5][R-5][R-5][R-5][R-6][R-6][R-6][R-6], ADVOCATE GENERAL[R-1][R-2]
	Transfer From Indore Bench	MERCHANTILE LAW-15000 - Contract Act, 1872-15002 - Contract Act, 1872-15002 Relief - TO SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED ORDER {FIXED DATE (COURT ORDER) COVID-19} **FOR CONSIDERING FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:- (I) WHETHER THE LOSS ARISING OUT OF BLACKLISTING ORDER CAN BE ASCERTAINABLE/ ASCERTAINED AND HENCE FALLS WITHIN THE AMBIT OF SECTION 2(1)(D) OF THE ADHIINIYAM. IF NOT, WHETHER THE FULL BENCH IN GOURI GANESH (SUPRA) AND DIVISION BENCH IN AWASTHI BROTHER CONSTRUCTION COMPANY (SUPRA) HAVE CORRECTLY OPINED THAT AGAINST BLACKLISTING ORDER ALSO CONTRACTOR HAS A REMEDY BEFORE THE TRIBUNAL CONSTITUTED UNDER THE ADHINIYAM ? (II) IF A COMPOSITE ORDER OF TERMINATION OF CONTRACT AND BLACKLISTING IS CALLED IN QUESTION IN A WRIT PETITION AND NO REMEDY IS AVAILABLE TO THE CONTRACTOR AGAINST THE BLACKLISTING ORDER BEFORE THE TRIBUNAL, WHETHER A WRIT PETITION AGAINST A COMPOSITE ORDER IS ENTERTAINABLE DESPITE AVAILABILITY OF REMEDY AGAINST THE TERMINATION OF WORKS CONTRACT UNDER THE ADHINIYAM ? FOR [APPL. FOR RECALLING OF PROCEEDING DATED 14.09.21] ON IA 10161/2021** 01-A PETITION FILED UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF CONSTITUTION	

TOTAL CASES : 1 (with connected matters)

PR (J) / R (J-I) / R(J-II)