

PETITIONER:
SABIR HUSSAIN & ANR.

Vs.

RESPONDENT:
STATE OF U.P. & ORS.

DATE OF JUDGMENT 30/11/1995

BENCH:
RAMASWAMY, K.
BENCH:
RAMASWAMY, K.
MAJMUDAR S.B. (J)

CITATION:
1996 SCC (1) 626 1995 SCALE (6) 777

ACT:

HEADNOTE:

JUDGMENT:

WITH
CIVIL APPEAL NO. 3488 OF 1979

Virendra Singh
V
State of U.P. & Ors.

O R D E R

Though the case has been called twice, the appellants are not present in person. We have taken the assistance of Shri K.S. Chauhan, learned counsel appearing for the State.

The controversy raised in this case is covered by the judgment of this Court in Ramesh Chand v. State of U.P. [(1980) 1 SCR 498] where this Court had held that "failure to specify number of services would not invalidate the draft scheme under Section 68 C or the approved scheme under Section 68D of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939". Same is the question in these appeals also. Under these circumstances, the omission to specify the number of services in the approved scheme does not invalidate the scheme already approved.

The appeals are accordingly dismissed but in the circumstances without costs.