

\$~13

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 830/2016**

UMANG JAIN

..... Petitioner

Represented by: **Mr.Anil Panwar, Adv.**

versus

BANK OF BARODA & ORS

..... Respondent

Represented by: **Ms.Priyadarshini Verma, Adv.**
for R-1.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP NANDRAJOG

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

%

02.02.2016

1. Since what has been challenged is a notice simplicitor counsel for the petitioner states that on second thoughts he advised the client, to which the client agreed, that the writ petition should be withdrawn because the writ petitioner has a right to respond to the notice dated January 06, 2016.
2. Accordingly the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn.
3. We note that the next date before the Recovery Officer-II, DRT-II, Delhi is February 04, 2016. Learned counsel for the petitioner thinks that today is Fourth February. We have cautioned him that he has two days to respond to the notice which he has challenged before us and he should speed up the response thereto.

CM 3632/2016 (stay)

Dismissed as not pressed.

PRADEEP NANDRAJOG, J.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

FEBRUARY 02, 2016 /'ga'