

2025 LiveLaw (SC) 183

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ABHAY S. OKA; J., UJJAL BHUYAN; J.
03-02-2025**

M.A. Dy. NOS. 33638/2024, 56379/2024 AND 1961/2025 WITH IA NO.164286/2024, IA NO.280409/2024 and IA NO.11092/2025 with CONMT.PET.(C) No. 829/2024 in C.A. No. 1376-1385/2013

**TRANSMISSION CORPORATION OF ANDHRA PRADESH LTD AND OTHERS
versus
M/S SLS POWER LIMITED AND OTHERS**

Contempt of Court - Allegations against Court Order - Applicants alleged that the Court recorded a statement/consent in its order dated 17th May 2024, which was not made by their counsel, amounting to an imputation against the Court. The Court deprecated such reckless allegations, emphasizing trust in counsel's statements and warning that such claims may necessitate affidavits to verify counsel's authority. Considering the applicants are public sector companies and their contention that counsel lacked authority, the Court recalled the order dated 17th May 2024, restoring the appeals at the applicants' risk, to be listed on 3rd March 2025. Applicants directed to pay Rs.5,00,000/- per application to the Supreme Court Legal Services Authority within three weeks as a condition precedent. Applications and related contempt petition disposed of accordingly. (Para 1 – 3)

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Gaurav Agarwal, Sr. Adv. Mr. Aditya Sondhi, Sr. Adv. Mr. Yelamanchili Shiva Santosh Kumar, Adv. Mr. Rudrajit Ghosh, Adv. Mr. Suvin Kumaran, Adv. Ms. Khyati Chhabra, Adv. Mr. J Maria Jerome, Adv. Mr. Tarun Gupta, AOR Mr. P.S. Patwalia, Sr. Adv. Ms. Liz Mathew, Sr. Adv. Ms. Sonali Jain, AOR Ms. Mallika Agarwal, Adv. Ms. Deveshi Chand, Adv. Mr. Omkar Hemanth, Adv. Mr. Annam Venkatesh, AOR Mr. Sravan Kumar Karanam, AOR Mr. Gaurav Agrawal, Sr. Adv. Mr. Kumar Abhishek, Adv. Mr. Aniket Singh, Adv. Mr. Nishant, AOR

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Y. Raja Gopala Rao, AOR Ms. Swapna Seshadri, Adv. Mr. Pramod Dayal, AOR Mr. Nikunj Dayal, Adv. Ms. Sneha Singh Baghel, Adv. Mr. Sadineni Ravi Kumar, AOR Mr. A. Venayagam Balan, AOR Mr. Gaurav Pal, Adv. Mr. Puneet Thakur, Adv. Mr. C.M. Sundaram, Adv. Mrs. D. Bharathi Reddy, AOR Mr. Gaichangpou Gangmei, Adv. Mr. Arjun D. Singh, Adv. Ms. Nisha Pandey, Adv. Mr. Maitreya Mahaley, Adv. Mr. Yimyang Longkumer, Adv. M/S AG Veritas Law, AOR Mr. P.S. Patwalia, Sr. Adv. Ms. Liz Mathew, Sr. Adv. Ms. Sonali Jain, AOR Ms. Mallika Agarwal, Adv. Ms. Deveshi Chand, Adv. Mr. Omkar Hemanth, Adv. Mr. Febin Mathew Varghese, AOR Mr. Dhiraj Abraham Philip, Adv. Ms. Achalika Ahuja, Adv.

ORDER

1. We are shocked at the allegations made by the applicants. What the applicants in substance want to suggest is that though we had recorded in the order dated 17th May 2024 the statement/consent of learned counsel appearing before us, in fact, no such statement was made before us on behalf of the applicants. We are shocked to know that such irresponsible and reckless allegations have been made against the Court and that also in the absence of the lawyers who were present on that day. The order records the presence of at least six advocates for the applicants. None of them are present today. The Court always trusts the learned counsel who appear before it and passes an order recording the submissions of the learned counsel. The Court is not expected to inquire whether the learned counsel representing the parties are really authorized in writing by their clients to make a particular statement. This is an allegation directly made against the Court that it has recorded a statement which was not made across the Bar. We deprecate

such a stand on the part of the applicants. Such imputations will compel the Court not to trust the statements of the learned counsel made across the Bar. When learned counsel make statements before the Court, before recording the same, the Court will have to take an affidavit of the learned counsel stating that they are really appearing for the parties and that the parties have instructed them to make a particular statement.

2. However, as it is contended that the learned counsel who appeared on that day for the appellants were either not authorised to represent the appellants/applicants or were not authorised to make a concession and as the appellants/applicants are public sector companies, we recall the order dated 17th May, 2024 and restore the appeals subject matter of these applications at the risk of the appellants/applicants. Place the restored appeals on 3rd March, 2025.

3. We direct the applicants to pay costs quantified at Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs) in each application to the Supreme Court Legal Services Authority within three weeks. The payment of costs shall be a condition precedent.

4. Applications are accordingly disposed of.

5. In view of above order, the contempt petition will not survive and the same is also disposed of.

© All Rights Reserved @LiveLaw Media Pvt. Ltd.

*Disclaimer: Always check with the original copy of judgment from the Court website. Access it [here](#)