



\$~R-8 & R-9

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ RFA 445/2008 and CM APPL. 5285/2014
SPARROW TECHNOLOGIES LTD.

.....Appellant

Through: None.

versus

RAVINDER P.KUMAR

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ravinder P. Kumar, respondent in person.

R-9

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ RFA 247/2010 and CM APPL. 8689/2013, CM APPL. 5281/2014
SPARROW TECHNOLOGIES LTD

.....Appellant

Through: None.

versus

ARCON ELECTRO PLAST PVT LTD

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ravinder P. Kumar, respondent in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

16.12.2024

%

1. The respondent is present in person.
2. None has appeared for the appellant despite the matters being called out on various dates i.e., 13.11.2024, 22.11.2024, 03.12.2024 and 10.12.2024 in RFA 445/2008, and on 17.09.2018, 01.10.2018, 09.10.2018, 11.10.2018, 10.12.2024 in RFA 247/2010.



3. The daily cause list published on the website of this Court clearly reflects a note for advocates and litigants that regular matters mentioned in the cause list shall be taken up after the supplementary and advance list is over. The physical display Board of this Court as well as the virtual display Board also clearly reflects that regular matters are being called and taken up for hearing.

4. Despite aforesaid, it is disheartening to see that for the matters listed in the regular list, neither the advocates nor the litigants are appearing before this Court.

5. The Court cannot be oblivious to the fact that due to the repeated listing of these cases, wherein, no one appears to pursue the matter, sufficient judicial time and resources are utilized which can effectively and thoughtfully be used for the cases wherein pressing issues of indispensable importance are canvassed before this Court. Because of the repeated listing of these cases, the other cases are not being called out, causing significant prejudice to the litigants.

6. Be that as it may, this is the fifth and sixth consecutive date in these matters, i.e. RFA 445/2008 and RFA 247/2010 respectively, when the appellant has not appeared to pursue this case.

7. Therefore, since none appeared on behalf of the appellant, the instant appeals, along with the pending application(s), are dismissed for want of prosecution.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

DECEMBER 16, 2024/ aks/sp