

\$~25

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CM(M) 478/2016**
MADAN LAL SAINI

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Rajesh Pandey, Advocate.

versus

MUKESH KUMAR SAINI

..... Respondent

Through Nemo.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER
% **17.05.2016**

C.M. Nos.18791-92/2016 (exemption)

Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

CM(M) 478/2016

Petitioner is aggrieved by the various orders of the Trial Judge. Submission is that his application under Order XII Rule 6 of the CPC was argued and put up for orders on 14.5.2015. The said order has been perused. The next date fixed after 14.5.2015 which was for orders on the application under Order XII Rule 6 of the CPC was 23.5.2015.

Obviously there were intervening dates in this period. The next date fixed before the Trial Court now is 07.7.2016. Learned counsel

for the petitioner submits that he is aggrieved by the fact that time and again adjournments have been granted on one pretext or the other in spite of the matter having been fixed for orders. After the application was argued the order has not yet been pronounced.

The Trial Court will dispose of the application under Order XII Rule 6 of the CPC expeditiously and preferably within a period of 15 days from the next fixed before the Trial Court which is stated to be 07.7.2016.

No further orders are called in this petition.

Petition disposed of.

Order dasti under signatures of the Court Master.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

MAY 17, 2016
ndn