

BABU LAL VS GYARSI LAL AND ORS.

Present: Mr. Himanshu Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. G.S.Gandhi, Advocate
for respondents No. 1 to 5

Notice to respondent No. 9 could not be issued as counsel for the petitioner did not comply with order dated 22.5.2018. However, counsel for the petitioner would point out order dated 10.1.2017 passed by this Court wherein similarly situated respondents No. 6 to 8 have been held to have no right in the tenanted premises being married daughters of Sh. Narain. In view of order dated 10.1.2017, respondent No. 9 being married daughter of Sh. Narain would have no right in the tenanted premises and accordingly, service of respondent No. 9 is dispensed with.

Service is complete.

IOIN stands disposed of.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

4.9.2018

PARAMJIT