

\$~10

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

+ RC.REV. 389/2017

RAM LAL KALRA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Gaurav Dubey, Advocate

Versus

ASHISH JAGGIA

..... Respondent

Through: None

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

% **23.10.2017**

1. This order is in continuation of the earlier order dated 21st September, 2017.

2. Mr. Arun Vohra and Ms. Aakriti Vohra, Advocates, who had appeared for the petitioners on the last date of hearing i.e. 29th September, 2017 and withdrawn the petition and confined the relief claimed herein only to grant of time to vacate the premises, have today chosen not to appear and have sent Mr. Gaurav Dubey, Advocate who states that Mr. Arun Vohra and Ms. Aakriti Vohra, Advocates did not understand what had happened in the Court on 21st September, 2017 and states that he had requested Mr. Arun Vohra and Ms. Aakriti Vohra, Advocates to take adjournment on 21st September, 2017 and otherwise, the petitioner does not want to withdraw this petition.

3. On enquiry as to where are Mr. Arun Vohra and Ms. Aakriti Vohra, Advocates, it is stated that they are in another Court. On further enquiry as to what action Mr. Gaurav Dubey, Advocate has taken against Mr. Arun

Vohra and Ms. Aakriti Vohra, Advocates for conducting themselves in the hearing on 21st September, 2017, contrary to his instructions, Mr. Gaurav Dubey laughs and states that he cannot take any action.

4. The respondent cannot be prejudiced by such games being played between Mr. Gaurav Dubey, Mr. Arun Vohra and Ms. Aakriti Vohra, Advocates. Mr. Arun Vohra and Ms. Aakriti Vohra, Advocates, on 21st September, 2017, did not state that they are appearing on behalf of Mr. Gaurav Dubey, Advocate or that they were not authorised to argue the petition. In fact, only after arguing the petition for some time did the said Advocates, under instruction from son of petitioner stated to be present in Court, state that they were not pressing the petition and withdrawing the same. Mr. Gaurav Dubey, Advocate cannot now be permitted to argue. Such abusive practices amongst the Bar have to be put to a stop. Merely by putting a different Advocate/face before the Court, change of orders cannot be obtained.

5. The son of the petitioner who was present on 21st September, 2017, on enquiry, is stated to be present in the Court today also and is found speaking in English and states that he is carrying on business.

6. The petitioner having, on 21st September, 2017, withdrawn the petition, the petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

7. I am refraining from imposing costs on petitioner.

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J.

**OCTOBER 23, 2017
P..**