

\$~31

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

+ CRL.M.C. 2088/2013

BRIJ BHUSHAN ATTRI ..... Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

REETA THAKUR ..... Respondent

Through

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.S.TEJI**

**ORDER**

% **30.08.2016**

1. There is no appearance on behalf of the petitioner despite third call.
2. The present petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 Cr.P.C. for setting aside the order dated 13.07.2012 and 17.04.2013 passed by the Trial Court.
3. The petition came up for hearing on 20.05.2013 when notice was issued to the respondent returnable for 19.09.2013 and the proceedings before the Trial Court were stayed. Thereafter despite service respondent did not enter appearance on 17.01.2014, 16.04.2014, 20.08.2014 and 11.12.2014. On 01.07.2015, court notice was directed to be issued to the respondent. However, on 20.01.2016,

it was reported that the respondent has been served at the second address, however, the summons could not be served upon her at the first address as the premises was locked. However, there was no appearance on behalf of the respondent. The petitioner was directed to take steps so that the notice could be served to the respondent at the correct address, returnable for 03.05.2016. The petitioner did not take necessary steps and vide order dated 03.05.2016, the petitioner was again directed to take steps within a week so that service of notice could be effected on the respondent returnable for 30.08.2016.

4. Today, neither there is any appearance on behalf of the petitioner nor steps have been taken by the petitioner as directed in terms of order dated 03.05.2016 and 30.08.2016.

5. The petitioner does not seem to be interested in prosecuting the matter.

6. Dismissed for non prosecution.

**P.S.TEJI, J**

**AUGUST 30, 2016/dm**