

\$~

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

3 to 6

+

ARB.P. 31/2017

SH AMARJIT SINGH KAPOOR & ANR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Sudhir Sharma and Mr D.P. Kaushik,
Advocates

versus

M/S ANSAL PROPERTIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE
LTD.

..... Respondent

Through: Mr Rohit Gupta with Mr Sumit Malhotra,
Advocates

WITH

+

ARB.P. 35/2017

SH JITENDER RAJPAL & ANR.

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Sudhir Sharma and Mr D.P. Kaushik,
Advocates

versus

ANSAL PROPERTIES & INFRASTRUCTURE LTD..... Respondent

Through: Mr Rohit Gupta with Mr Sumit
Malhotra, Advocates

WITH

+

ARB.P. 36/2017

VARUN TANDON & ANR.

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Sudhir Sharma and Mr D.P. Kaushik,
Advocates

versus

ANSAL PROPERTIES & INFRASTRUCTURE LTD..... Respondent

Through: Mr Rohit Gupta with Mr Sumit
Malhotra, Advocates

WITH

+ **ARB.P. 37/2017**
VIKAS GUPTA & ANR. Petitioner
Through: Mr Sudhir Sharma and Mr D.P. Kaushik,
Advocates

versus

ANSAL PROPERTIES & INFRASTRUCTURE LTD..... Respondent
Through: Mr Rohit Gupta with Mr Sumit
Malhotra, Advocates

CORAM: JUSTICE S.MURALIDHAR

ORDER
% **27.03.2017**

1. The Court notices that the legal demand notice dated 7th December, 2016 sent by the Petitioners to the Respondent lacks clarity as to the relief sought by the Petitioners. In other words, it is not clear as to whether the Petitioners want possession of the shops in question and damages or are seeking refund of the entire amount paid together with interest and damages.

2. It is stated by learned counsel for the Petitioners that a fresh notice making the above position clear will be issued by the Petitioners to the Respondent within one week from today.

3. In that view of the matter, the above petitions are not entertained at this

stage. They are accordingly dismissed with liberty to the Petitioners to renew the prayer after a proper legal demand notice as undertaken is issued to the Respondent and if no proper response thereto is received.

S.MURALIDHAR, J

MARCH 27, 2017

rd