

spite of affirming on the ledger paper, the Respondent affirmed it on the white paper at Delhi. She therefore, prays for time. The copy of the said reply is not given to the Petitioner.

2. In order to save time, the reply which is affirmed on white paper is taken on record temporarily and the copy of the said reply is to be served on the Petitioner in the Court. The Respondent is directed to file reply affirmed on the ledger paper within a week.

3. The Petitioner refuses to accept the copy of the reply in the Court as she pointed out that this Court has passed the order that the service is to be made through R.P.A.D./Post. It is directed to the Petitioner to accept the reply in the open Court. However, she does not want to accept and she want to file a written objection on the point of mode of service.

4. The Petitioner is asked to open her submissions on the Review Petition No. 38 of 2015. However, she submits that it is not possible for her to argue on the Review Petition No. 38 of 2015 unless there is reply given by the Respondent on the Application No. 10 of 2015. The Petitioner submits that she is ready to argue the Review Petition No. 38 of 2015 if this Court passes the order of 'No Say' in Application No. 10 of 2015.

5. No say order is passed in Application No. 10 of 2015.

6. On 30th July, 2015 the Petitioner made her submissions and the Respondent filed his reply in Review Petition No. 38 of 2015. However, the Petitioner submit that this reply cannot be considered as a reply. The Petitioner submit that the Respondent did not file reply in the Application No. 10 of 2015. Consequently, the

Respondent has lost his right to submit as far as the proceeding in Review Petition No. 38 of 2015 is concerned.

7. This Court has passed the order in Application No. 10 of 2015 as 'No Reply'. However, the Respondent has filed reply in Review Petition No. 38 of 2015. Therefore, the submission made by the Petitioner-party in person has no substance. So the Respondent is asked to make submission on the Review Petition No. 38 of 2015.

8. The learned counsel for the Respondent submits that the Review Petition No. 38 of 2015 is not maintainable under the Representation of the People Act as there is no such provision. She further submits that whatever prayers made in the application, they are not in the nature of review considering the order passed by this Court on 31st July, 2015. She further submits that thus the

Review Petition become infructuous. She relied on the reply filed by the Respondent. She further submits that to this reply, the Petitioner has filed re-joinder.

9. The Petitioner is asked to give reply to the submissions made by the learned counsel for the Respondent. The Petitioner refused to make submission on the ground that she does not acknowledged all the submissions made by the learned counsel for the Respondent as they have not filed reply to the Application No. 10 of 2015. She submits that this Court to direct the learned counsel for the Respondent to make her submission hereinafter in other matters on the affidavit.

10. Perused the Review Petition and the prayers made therein. The prayers are as follows:

a) Modify the order passed on 11th September, 2014 to record the objection taken against the inspection spelt out by

the Respondent.

b) The Election Petition No. 3 of 2014 filed by the Petitioner should be taken on a separate date than that of Election Petition No. 1 of 2014.

c) Records pertaining to the inspection desired by the Respondent viz. the application and the order thereof if any be granted to her.

d) The three weeks time allowed to the Respondent of Election Petition No. 3 of 2014 be curtailed to date of 22nd September, 2014 on which they may be asked to file their written statement without further delay.

11. It is necessary to mention that this Petition though it is captioned as Review Petition, the Petitioner has served different orders and sought some prayers in the form of prayer clauses b), c) and d).

12. The prayer clause b) and d) now become

redundant due to the passage of time and therefore the Petitioner is not pressing it.

13. The prayer clause c) is allowed.

14. Considering the prayer a) it is not a Review Petition but it should have been given before the Court as 'speaking to the minutes'. I have read the order dated 11th September, 2014 along with the Petitioner. The Petitioner wants that at the relevant time, objection was taken against the inspection and that is not recorded so and it is to be recorded now.

15. After going through the said order, it appears that on that day the Power of Attorney holder of the Petitioner in person was present though the name of the Petitioner is also appearing as the Petitioner in person present. I do not remember whether such objection was taken

either by the Power of Attorney holder or the Petitioner in person on that day. The learned counsel for the Respondent also does not remember. Under such circumstances, no speaking to the minutes and the prayer made under clause a) of this Petition can not be entertained.

16. In view of the above, the Review Petition No. 38 of 2015 is disposed of.

17. The Petitioner submits that as the Application No. 6 of 2015 is disposed of by the order dated 4th August, 2015, now she want that Application No. 12 of 2015 should also be disposed of as it has no separate standing of its own.

18. In view of this submission, the Application No. 12 of 2015 is disposed of.

19. The learned counsel for the Respondent has pointed out that the Petitioner has not filed

reply in Application (L) No. 7 and 8 of 2014 on the point of maintainability under Order 7 Rule 11 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

20. The Petitioner submits that she has strong objection to the proceeding in Application (L) No. 7 and 8 of 2014 and these objections are recorded in Review Petition No. 51 of 2015 which was served to the Respondent immediately when it was filed after the order dated 18th June, 2015 and she has not received any reply to that.

21. It is made clear to both the parties that the Application (L) Nos. 7 and 8 of 2014 will be taken up for hearing on 17th August, 2015. The matter is now fixed by consent to 17th August, 2015 for direction in Application (L) Nos. 7 and 8 of 2014 at 4.30 pm.

(MRS.MRIDULA BHATKAR, J.)