

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

Kunj Aluminium P.Ltd.

Vs.

Koninklijke Philips

C.A.No.2915 of 2011

(Markandey Katju and Gyan Sudha Misra, JJ.,)

04.04.2011

JUDGMENT

Markandey Katju, J.,

SLP.(Civil)No.9553 of 2010

1. Leave granted.
2. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
3. This appeal has been filed against the impugned judgment of the Delhi High Court dated 30.11.2009 passed in Letters Patent Appeal No.613 of 2009. Without going into the merits of the controversy we find that the impugned judgment of the Division Bench dated 30.11.2009 gives no reasons.
4. The impugned judgment of the Division Bench only states :
 - "5. We have heard Mr. Arvind Nigam, learned Senior counsel appearing for the appellant at length. We have also perused the documents on records as well as the impugned judgment of the learned Single Judge.
 6. We are of the considered view that the impugned order suffers from no legal infirmity which warrants interference by way of appeal."
5. In our opinion this was not the way to dispose off an appeal. The impugned order is too cryptive. There should have been at least a brief discussion of facts and some reasons. It has been held by this Court that even an order of affirmance must give some reasons, even if brief vide Chairman, Disciplinary Authority, *Rani Lakshmi Bai Kshetriya Gramin Bank vs. Jagdish Sharan Varshney & Ors'*. Hence we set aside the impugned order and remand the matter to the Division Bench for a fresh hearing in accordance with law, expeditiously.

6. Appeal is allowed. No costs.

¹JT 2009(4) SC 0519