

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA.

MISC.CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 424 OF 2019

IN

MISC.CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 388 OF 2018

COMMUNIDADE OF CANACONA,
THR. ITS ADMINISTRATOR/
ATTORNEY.,

... Applicant

Versus

KRISHNANAND G. NAIK
GAUNKER AND 4 ORS.,

... Respondents.

Shri Hanumant D. Naik, Advocate for the applicant.

Ms. Akshata Bhat, Advocate for respondent nos.1, 2, 3 & 4.

Coram: - DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

Date: - 9th December 2019

P.C.

The applicant wanted the delay condoned. This Court condoned the delay, on a condition—the condition of the applicant's paying costs of Rs.5,000/-. He had to pay the costs in a time frame. That time was extended twice. But the applicant has not complied with the condition. Again, on 6th December 2019, the applicant once again asked for time extension. What ought to have been complied with in three weeks has not been complied with in over one year.

2. Then, on the last occasion, the Court gave one last chance for the applicant to prove his *bona fides* by producing today a demand draft for Rs.5,000/-, that being the costs this Court imposed, so this Court

may consider the applicant's request for extension of time. But today, too, the applicant has failed.

3. The applicant's counsel for the applicant informs the Court that despite his informing the applicant about the requirement, he has not turned up—leave alone his complying with the condition.

I, therefore, find no justification for showing any more leniency to the applicant. I accordingly dismiss the application on the grounds of delay.

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

vn