

ATUL

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 843 OF 2016
IN
NOTICE OF MOTION (L) NO. 2875 OF 2015
IN
SUIT NO. 1140 OF 2015

Sebastian Andrade	...Plaintiff
<i>Versus</i>	
Expedia Inc & 3 Others	...Defendants

Mr. Deepak A. Lad, *for the Plaintiff.*
Ms. Kathleen Lobo, *with Ms. Aastha Arora, i/b Khaitan & Co., for*
Defendants Nos. 1, 2 and 4.

CORAM: G.S. PATEL, J
DATED: 12th July 2016

PC:-

1. The Plaintiff's Advocate's office has been most remiss. After having obtained an ad-interim order on 30th October 2015, Mr. Lad's office allowed the principal Notice of Motion to be dismissed for non-removal of office objections. That objection was utterly trivial. I cannot understand why Mr. Lad's staff could not find the time between October 2015 and February 2016 to comply with so minor a matter.

2. The present Notice of Motion by the Plaintiff seeks restoration of Notice of Motion (L) No. 2875 of 2015 and revival of the ad-interim order dated 30th October 2015. In fairness to the Plaintiff, that must follow. I do not see why, however, this conduct by an advocate's office should be excused. This seems to happen repeatedly in this Court. It must stop.

3. Mr. Lad in fairness accepts responsibility for the lapse. He states that he will personally pay costs as condition precedent quantified at Rs. 10,000/- to the Bombay High Court Law Library. These costs will be paid within one week from today.

4. On those costs being paid, the Notice of Motion (L) No. 2875 of 2015 to stand restored to file along with ad-interim order dated 30th October 2015.

5. Notice of Motion (L) No. 2875 of 2015 is otherwise ready for hearing and final disposal. List that Notice of Motion on the weekly board of 8th August 2016.

6. With these observations and directions, the Notice of Motion is disposed of with no order as to costs.

(G. S. PATEL, J.)