

\$~17

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

+ LA.APP. 155/2016

UNION OF INDIA

..... Appellant

Through: Proxy counsel for the appellant

versus

HARI SINGH (DECEASED) & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Karan Sharma, Advocate for
DDA/R-2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

% **22.02.2017**

1. As per the office report, notice could not be issued to legal heirs respondent No.1 as process fee returned under objection.

2. The Advocate who appeared as proxy counsel for the appellant/UOI has given the slip of appearance of Ms.Jyoti Tyagi, Advocate and not of his name.

3. These are sixteen Land Acquisition Appeals listed today at Serial No.8 to 11 and 13 to 24 which were filed by the appellant/Union of India and in all these appeals the situation is same.

4. Though Ms.Jyoti Tyagi, Advocate appeared on behalf of UOI before this Court in other matters listed today but when these matters listed at Serial No.8 to 11 and 13 to 24 were taken up, another advocate has appeared as proxy counsel for the UOI. On his attention being drawn that despite directions for service of respondent(s) vide ordinary process, speed post,

courier and dasti, in all these matters, necessary steps have not been taken, he seeks another adjournment to do the needful.

5. Perusal of the Part-B of the file shows that only process fee was filed and that too remained lying under objection. No steps were taken to get the notice served through speed post and courier.

6. Perusal of the record shows that on each date of hearing the proxy counsel had been appearing on behalf of appellant/UOI. Despite the opportunities being given on the previous dates of hearing, necessary steps have not been taken to get the respondent(s) served. Order dated 15th September, 2016 was not complied with as process fee was not filed. When another opportunity was given on 2nd December, 2016 to get the respondent(s) served, the process fee remained lying under objection till date.

7. On failure of the appellant to get the respondent(s) served by taking necessary steps, this appeal is dismissed for want of prosecution.

8. LCR be sent back.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

FEBRUARY 22, 2017

'st'