

201 IOIN RSA-2624-1995
SURINDER SIGH VS. SATPAL AND ANR.

Present: Mr. Ram Chander, Advocate
for the appellant.

This appeal was put up for hearing only for the reason that, though it was admitted to regular hearing in the year 2007, service was not complete upon the respondents. Consequently, on 03.06.2016, learned counsel for the appellant was directed to file the process fee along with the fresh address of respondent no.2.

Today, Sh. Ram Chander, learned counsel for the appellant, submits that as a matter of fact respondent no.2 is not a necessary party and service upon him may be dispensed with.

Ordered accordingly, subject to just exceptions.

Since the first respondent seems to have been served, with no adverse report on the service shown by the Registry, the appeal would now come up for hearing on its own turn.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

November 18, 2016.
Davinder Kumar