

\$~39

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

+ **FAO 242/2016 & C.M.No.20098/2016**

VIVEK PURWAR & ANRAppellants

Through: **Mr. Jagdish Sagar & Mr. Praveen
Kumar Jain, Advocates**

versus

SURESH CHAND PURWAR (KARTA) & ANRRespondents

Through: **Mr. Ajay Amitabh Suman,
Advocate for Mr.S.K.Bansal,
Advocate
Mr. Manish Shankar Shrivastava,
Advocate for respondent No.1**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER

01.09.2016

%

Learned counsel for appellants submits that second respondent is a proforma party and no relief is claimed against it in this appeal.

Earlier, Mr. S.K. Bansal, Advocate, had appeared on behalf of first respondent. Mr. Ajay Amitabh Suman, Advocate appearing for Mr. S.K. Bansal, Advocate, submits that there are no instructions from respondent No.1.

Mr. Manish Shankar Shrivastava, Advocate, who now appears for respondent No.1 submits that there are instructions from the first respondent to seek return of the plaint and an application for return of the plaint has been filed before the trial court but the records are here.

In view of the stand taken as aforesaid, learned counsel for appellants submits that this appeal has become infructuous.

This appeal and application are accordingly disposed of as infructuous. Records be remitted back forthwith.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

SEPTEMBER 01, 2016

r