

C.M.P.No.7805 of 2021
in
S.A.S.R.No.37905 of 2021

P.T.ASHA, J.,

The Bank who is the contesting respondent has been served. The 1st respondent is none else than the father of the appellant herein and it is rather surprising that the appellant is unable to serve notice on his father.

2. Be that as it may, considering the fact that the 1st respondent remained ex parte before both the Courts, notice to him is dispensed with in this Second Appeal for the present.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the contesting respondent has no objection to the delay being condoned. Accordingly, the delay is condoned. The Registry is directed to number the above Second Appeal.


04.08.2021

kan

WEB COPY

P.T.ASHA, J.,

kan



C.M.P.No.7805 of 2021 in
S.A.S.R.No.37905 of 2021

WEB COPY

04.08.2021