

208 IOIN-RSA-1533-2008

KAMLESH RANI VS SOM NATH ETC.

Present Mr. N.C. Kinra, Advocate
 for the appellant.

As per the office note put up by the Registry, it is stated that learned counsel for the appellant has not taken necessary steps to affix service on respondent No. 3 as reflected in the Memo of Parties at Page-12 of the paper-book.

Mr. N.C. Kinra, learned counsel for the appellant, points out that Raj Rani who has been reflected as respondent No. 3 was in-fact arrayed as defendant No.2 before the Civil Judge, Rohtak, who stood proceeded as ex-parte vide order dated 15.05.1997. Even before the Appellate Authority, Raj Rani had been arrayed as defendant-respondent No.2 and the Appellate Authority had taken note of the fact that she had been proceeded ex-parte before the trial Court, therefore, service upon her would not be necessary.

Service in the case is deemed to be complete.

IOIN disposed of accordingly.

September 12, 2019

seema

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE