

C.O. No. 866 of 1994
with
IA No. C.A.N. 1 of 2002
(Old No. C.A.N. 2457 of 2002)

Smt. Gita Barman
Vs.
Rakhal Chandra Barman
(Via video conference)

Since service could not be effected on the learned advocate for the petitioner despite endeavour of the department, the matter is taken up for hearing.

None appears on behalf of either of the parties at the time of call.

Accordingly, C.O. No. 866 of 1994 along with C.A.N. 1 of 2002 (old No. C.A.N. 2457 of 2002) are dismissed for default.

Rule, if any issued, stands discharged.

Interim order, if any passed, stands automatically vacated.

There will be no order as to costs.

(Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.)