

\$~3

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

RFA 566/2016 & CM Nos.28747-50/2016

U E TRADE CORPORATION (INDIA) PVT LTD Appellant

Through: None

versus

DR BHUPESH MANGLA Respondent

Through: Mr. Amit Bansal, Mr. Saurabh Tiwari &
Ms. Surbhi Mehta, Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SIDDHARTH MRIDUL

ORDER

%

21.09.2016

Learned counsel for the respondent has invited my attention to the order dated 29th August, 2016 to urge that, inadvertently, instead of recording that the present appeal has not been taken for hearing so as to enable the appellant to deposit the decretal amount, it was mistakenly recorded that the appeal has not been taken up for hearing in order to enable the appellant to deposit the requisite court fee in accordance with law.

In view of the foregoing, the order dated 29th August, 2016 is modified as follows and shall henceforth read as under:

“At request of learned counsel appearing for the appellant, in order to enable him to deposit the decretal amount, the present appeal in not being taken up for hearing today.

Renotify on 21st September, 2016.”

None appears for the appellant. There was no appearance on behalf of the appellant at the first call either. The decretal amount has also not been deposited. It seems that the appellant does not seem keen to prosecute the appeal. The appeal is dismissed in default for non-prosecution.

The pending applications also stand dismissed.

SIDDHARTH MRIDUL, J

SEPTEMBER 21, 2016/tp