

\$~1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ C.R.P. 154/2017 & CMs No.24914/2017 & 24915/2017 (for
condonation of 4 days delay in filing and 236 days delay in re-filing
respectively)

PRAHLAD SWAROOP AGGARWAL Petitioner

Through: Petitioner-in-person.

Versus

MANOJ

..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

%

27.07.2017

1. Today also one gentleman claiming to be the petitioner appears and states that his advocate Sh. Rajit Kumar Dubey is not available but has asked him to convey to this Court “to transfer the case”.
2. I have enquired, where does the advocate for the petitioner, who has chosen to not appear himself, wants the case to be transferred.
3. The petitioner has no instructions in this regard.
4. I have already in order dated 18th July, 2017 observed that the challenge in this Revision Petition is to an order of rejection of the plaint and which order is a deemed decree under Section 2(2) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 and is appealable as such. Reference, if any required can also be made to the dicta of this Court in *Kartar Singh Vs. Shanti* 2004 (73) DRJ 361 holding that no Revision Petition is maintainable.
5. The Revision Petition is rejected.
6. Needless to state the petitioner shall have remedy available in law.

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J.

JULY 27, 2017/bs..