



\$~1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **FAO 609/2001 & CM APPL. 1101/2001**
SURENDER NATH

.....Appellant

Through: None.

versus

RAJENDER NATH & ORS.

.....Respondent

Through: Appearance not given.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE CHANDRASEKHARAN SUDHA

ORDER
16.12.2025

%

1. A perusal of the office noting shows that the Court notice, issued to the appellant as well as his counsel on the last date of hearing, i.e., 15.09.2025, was returned with the report that both of them have expired.

2. Notice issued to the respondents returned with the report that respondent nos. 2 and 3 have expired, and notice issued to the respondent no. 1 was returned "refused" as it was refused by his son. The other respondents remain unserved.



3. The appellant is reported to have passed away and as none of his legal representatives have so far come on record, and as the counsel appearing for him is also no more, no purpose would be served by issuing notice to the same address furnished along with this appeal.

4. Hence, the appeal is dismissed as abated.

CHANDRASEKHARAN SUDHA, J

DECEMBER 16, 2025/mj