

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

INHERENT JURISDICTION

I.A. NO. OF 2025

IN

REVIEW PETITION (CIVIL) NO. OF 2025

IN

WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 706 OF 2025

IN THE MATTER OF:

MATHEWS J. NEDUMPARA & ORS.

PETITIONERS

VERSUS

THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA & ORS.

RESPONDENTS

APPLICATION FOR ORAL HEARING OF REVIEW PETITION IN

OPEN COURT

TO

**THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE OF
INDIA AND HIS COMPANION JUDGES OF
THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA**

**THE HUMBLE PETITION OF THE REVIEW
PETITIONERS IN PERSONS ABOVE NAMED**

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH:

1. The Review Petition under Article 137 of the Constitution of India read with Order XLVII of the Supreme Court Rules, 2013 filed against the final impugned judgment dated 07.08.2025 passed by this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 706 of 2025, whereby this Hon'ble Court has erroneously dismissed the Writ Petition filed by the Petitioners in Persons herein.

2. That the facts of the case have been fully set out in the Review Petition. It is submitted that the facts stated in the Review Petition may be treated as part of this Application.
3. How this Court deals with the complaints of corruption or other misdemeanor involving members of higher judiciary is a question which the Petitioners, nay, the people of this country, watched with bated breath to be answered when the incident of huge volumes of currency catching fire came into the public domain. The Petitioners, nay, many well-meaning citizens expected the Court to act swiftly and take stringent action, to set the criminal law in motion, direct just and fair inquiry which would bring all involved in polluting the stream of justice to the book – the bribe taker, bribe giver, fixers, middlemen and the like. With the greatest of respect, the Petitioners beg to submit that to state that the manner in which this Court was pleased to deal with the three writ petitions which the Petitioners filed one after the other, primarily seeking the registration of an FIR and investigation by the police, which would mean collecting evidence, securing the scene of the crime, taking custody of the material, the burned and unburned notes, and not an inquiry by judges which the 3-judge committee undertook, has been a disappointment would be an understatement.
4. The Court ought to have directed the registration of an FIR when the Petitioners approached this court on the first instance. However, it did not

happen even on the third time after the report of the 3-judge committee indicting Justice Varma came to be in the public domain. The Petitioners' writ petition came to be dismissed holding that though the Petitioners had averred that they have approached the executive, nay, the Prime Minister, President and the Home Minister, no such representation was produced along with the writ petition. This Court further went on to hold that in a petition seeking mandamus based on demand and refusal, a copy of such a representation ought to be annexed with the petition, and that the Petitioners had not done so was an added reason for the rejection of the Petitioners' writ petition.

5. The Petitioners had indeed produced the representation dated 26.5.2025 as Annexure P5 at pages 118 to 122. This Court happened to make such scathing observations finding fault with the Petitioners when the Petitioners had indeed produced the representation. This Court happened to make the said observation and dismissed the petition on the erroneous impression of the Petitioners not having produced what is already a part of the petition. This is a manifest error, which has led the court to arrive at an erroneous conclusion as to the maintainability of the petition on a pure question of law, namely, that no mandamus will lie without a demand and refusal and secondly the proof of such demand being made by means of a representation.

6. The aforesaid error has led to grave miscarriage of justice leading to those involved in the offence of corruption, money laundering and other offences escape the penal laws of the country. It has also led to the perception that when it comes to corruption in judiciary this Court fails to apply the same yardstick it applies to others. This case therefore, undoubtedly comes under the exceptional category of cases where an in-chamber hearing in the absence of the Petitioners would lead to grave miscarriage of justice.
7. It is submitted that the Review Petitioner in Persons has narrated all the reasons to establish that the judgment of this Hon'ble Court suffers from error apparent on the face of the record. The same are not reproduced herein for the sake of brevity.
8. In view of the various submissions made by the Review Petitioners in Persons. It is respectfully submitted that this Hon'ble court may have the indulgence to allow oral hearing of the Review Petition in the interest of justice.

PRAYER

In the circumstances it is most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to:

- (i) Allow the present application for oral hearing of the Review Petition against the final impugned judgment dated 07.08.2025 passed by this Hon'ble Court in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 706 of 2025; and

(ii) Pass such other and further relief, as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

**AND FOR WHICH ACT OF KINDNESS THE REVIEW PETITIONERS
IN PERSON SHALL AS IN DUTY BOUND EVER PRAY.**

Filed by:

**MATHEWS J. NEDUMPARA
REVIEW PETITIONER IN PERSON NO. 1
9820535428**

Place: New Delhi
Dated: 22.08.2025