

\$~16

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ **TEST.CAS. 29/2003**  
**SUNIL KUMAR SETHI** ..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anuroop P.S., Adv.

Versus

**THE STATE & ORS.** ..... Respondents

Through: Mr. R.L. Kohli, Adv. for R-4.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW**

**ORDER**

% **30.01.2017**

1. Mr. R.L. Kholi, Advocate for respondent no.4 states that cost, which in terms of order dated 22<sup>nd</sup> November, 2016, was to be paid not later than 28<sup>th</sup> November, 2016 has not been paid.
2. The counsel for the petitioner states it has been paid.
3. The petitioner has also not taken any steps for service of the unserved respondents / close relatives.
4. In the order dated 22<sup>nd</sup> November, 2016, it was made clear that if the petitioner does not take the steps, the petition shall be dismissed for non-prosecution.
5. The petition is accordingly dismissed for non-prosecution.
6. List tomorrow i.e. 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2017 for the counsel for the petitioner to support his statement made today that cost has been paid.

**RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J**

**JANUARY 30, 2017**

‘gsr’..