

\$~R-5 and R-6

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

+ RFA 257/2004

RAMESH CHANDRA A. BOLE Appellant
Through: Mr. Rupal Luthra, Advocate.

versus

JAGDISH CHANDRA A. BOLE & ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Sandip Kumar, Advocate.

+ RSA 11/2004

RAMESH CHANDRA A. BOLE Appellant
Through: Mr. Rupal Luthra, Advocate.

versus

JAGDISH CHANDRA A. BOLE & ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Sandip Kumar, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VALMIKI J. MEHTA

ORDER

% **20.09.2017**

1. Counsel for the appellant is said to be suffering from fever and therefore adjournment is prayed in these cases. Counsel for the respondents very vehemently opposes the adjournment on the ground that appellant has been consistently taking adjournments even earlier and the impugned judgment decides the limited point of the suit for dissolution of partnership and rendition of accounts filed by the appellant/plaintiff is barred by

limitation having been filed in the year 1999 when admittedly the dissolution notice was given in November, 1990. This is the issue in RFA No.257/2004.

2. Adjournment is only prayed for today and it is stated that these appeals will be argued tomorrow on behalf of the appellant. Accordingly, while these appeals are adjourned for 25th September, 2017, however, counsel for the appellant Mr. Prithu Garg, Advocate will file his personal affidavit as regards his illness supported by the medical certificate and which directions are passed in view of the vehement opposition of the counsel for the respondents of the adjournments of the appeals.

VALMIKI J. MEHTA, J

SEPTEMBER 20, 2017

Ne