

**FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET
IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA
APPELLATE SIDE**

MISC.CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 124 OF 2014

IN

FIRST APPEAL NO. 105 OF 2013

MRS. MARIA ROSA JOANITA CRUZ E
COSTA FERNANDES @ ROBERT JERONIMO
COSTA FERNANDES AND ANR.

... Applicants

Versus

MR. ALBERTO VAS AND 51 ORS.

... Respondents

Ms. S. Chodankar, Advocate holding for Mr. Valmiki Menezes,
Advocate for applicants.

REGISTRAR'S ORDER

If we read affidavit of service dated 11.02.2014 and bailiff's report dated 03.09.2013, respondent No. 13 and 14, 43 to 47 are seen duly served with the notice by way of affixation as per Order V Rule 17 CPC. However, respondents No. 7 to 12, 25 to 30, 40 and 41 cannot be said as duly served with the notice as per bailiff's report dated 03.09.2013. It is true these respondents refused to accept the notice and, moreover, not allowed the bailiff to affix the notice on the main door. But the fact remains on record provisions under Order V Rule Rule 17 CPC remained to be completed. So, applicants will have to take fresh steps again to serve with the notice upon respondents No. 7 to 12, 25 to 30, 40 and 41.

Hence, MCA partially allowed and disposed.

Date: 4th February, 2016

(P. M. Shinde)
Deputy Registrar

ms