

\$~21

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

+ CM(M) 1005/2016 & CM No. 36612/2016

MANJU VATS

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ankit Jain with Mr. Sarvesh Rai,
Advocates.

versus

MEENA PANDEY

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Gaurav Sarin with Mr. S.K. Rout,
Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.K.GAUBA

ORDER

%

07.12.2017

After some hearing, the learned counsel on both sides agree and submit that the application under Order VI Rule 17 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC), dated 18.05.2016, presented by the petitioner in the course of proceedings arising out of the petition seeking revocation of the grant of letters of administration (P.C. No. 27/16 & P.C. No. 06/13), may be partly allowed, it having been insisted upon by the petitioner and conceded by the opposite side that such amendments as would be incorporated in the petition seeking revocation of the letters of administration would not include proposed para nos. 23A(A), (B), (C), and the second sentence (“*There is no personal service effected upon Shri Arun Vats*”) as reflected in para 23A(D), and para 23A(J).

The application is allowed accordingly and to the extent mentioned above. Needless to add, the paragraphs which are being

allowed to be incorporated will have to be suitably re-numbered. With liberty for amendment as above being granted, the impugned order stands modified accordingly and the petition stands disposed of with these directions.

The interim order would obviously stand vacated and the proceedings before the trial court may continue.

The pending application is rendered infructuous and stands disposed of.

R.K.GAUBA, J

DECEMBER 07, 2017

srb