

\$~R-15

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

+ W.P.(C). 7438/2006

VIJAY SINGH ARYA

..... Petitioner

Represented by: None

versus

UNION OF INDIA

..... Respondent

Represented by: Ms.Barkha Babbar, Advocate
for UOI with Mr.Akhil Suri,
Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP NANDRAJOG

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

%

18.07.2016

1. Shown before the previous Bench at regular item No.63 the writ petition reached for hearing on February 12, 2016. None appeared for the petitioner. Ms.Barkha Babbar, Advocate was directed to inform Mr.A.K.Behura, Advocate who had filed the writ petition about the pendency of the writ petition. It was indicated in the order that the matter would not be taken up till February 18, 2016.

2. Order dated February 19, 2016 records that Ms.Barkha Babbar, Advocate had informed Mr.A.K.Behura, Advocate that the matter would be taken up on February 19, 2016. Noting that learned counsel for the petitioner did not appear no adverse order was passed. The writ petition was retained on the Board.

3. The matter came up for hearing on February 23, 2016 when wife of the petitioner appeared in person. It was indicated in the order dated February 23, 2016 that the matter would be retained in the category of 'Regular Matters'.
4. Thereafter, it appears that the matter reached for hearing on March 03, 2016. None appeared for the petitioner. The matter was retained on the Board. One Mr.Amar Pandey, stating himself to be the proxy counsel sent by Mr.A.K.Behura, Advocate appeared afterwards. The second order dated March 03, 2016 was penned noting that the matter would now be taken up upon its turn reaching on March 21, 2016.
5. On March 21, 2016 Mr.Amar Pandey appeared as proxy counsel and said that Mr.A.K.Behura, Advocate had requested for hearing to be deferred. The Court recorded that it would not hear the matter till March 28, 2016.
6. Order dated April 01, 2016 records that the matter had reached for hearing. Once again Mr.A.K.Behura, Advocate sent a proxy counsel. At his request, it was indicated that the matter would now be taken up in the week commencing April 04, 2016. Thereafter, on April 07, 2016 and April 25, 2016 none appeared for the petitioner. At request of proxy counsel for the respondents, the matter was not taken up.
7. Order dated May 09, 2016 notes none had appeared on behalf of the petitioner. Matter was retained on the Board.
8. On May 10, 2016 proxy counsel once again appeared for the petitioner and requested that the matter should not be taken up. The Court obliged.
9. Thereafter, none appeared for the petitioner on May 12, 2016 as also May 13, 2016.

10. With a change of roster the instant matter has been shown at regular Serial No.15. It has reached for hearing. It is 2:45 PM. None appeared for the petitioner.

11. The writ petition is dismissed in default.

PRADEEP NANDRAJOG, J.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

JULY 18, 2016/‘pg’