

\$~19.

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ LA.APP. 24/2016, CM No.2551/2016 (for condonation of 2095 days delay in filing the appeal) and CM No.2553/2016 (u/O XLI R-27 CPC).

PARDEEP KUMAR JINDAL AND ANR Appellants
Through: Mr. O.P. Pahuja and Mr. G.C. Yadav,
Advts.

versus

UOI AND ANR Respondents
Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain, Adv. for UOI.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER
% **26.07.2018**

1. This appeal under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 is accompanied with an application for condonation of 2095 days delay in filing thereof.
2. Notice of the appeal was ordered to be issued and the counsel for the respondent no.1 Union of India (UOI) entered appearance. Besides respondent no.1 the appellants have only impleaded one Dalel Singh Ramesh Kumar son of Kehar Singh as respondent no.2. It is not known whether Dalel Singh Ramesh Kumar are one person only or more than one person or a firm.
3. The certified copy of the impugned judgment dated 4th December, 2009 in LAC No.124/08/02, being a Reference under Sections 30&31 of the Act does not show who were the parties to the reference, though a reading of the impugned judgment indicates that there were as many as 13 claimants.
4. The counsel for the two appellants on enquiry, has drawn attention to page 123 wherefrom it appears that there were as many as 16 claimants named in the reference.

5. I have enquired from the counsel for the appellants as to why the remaining persons who were parties to the Reference have not been impleaded and as to how the appeal is maintainable without impleading them.

6. The counsel is unable to satisfy.

7. The appeal is accordingly rejected as not maintainable.

8. Needless to state, the appellants, in accordance with law will be entitled to file a proper appeal.

No costs.

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J

JULY 26, 2018

‘pp’..