



\$~11 & 12

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CRL.L.P. 455/2011 & CRL.M.A. 6747/2016**

KHOSLA TRAVELS PVT LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

INDER PAUL SINGH & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through None.

+ **CRL.L.P. 456/2011 & CRL.M.A. 6746/2016**

KHOSLA TRAVELS PVT LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

INDER PAUL SINGH & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

29.05.2025

1. On 13th April, 2022, there was no appearance on behalf of the parties, yet no adverse orders were passed, and the matter was deferred to 15th September, 2022. On the said date, the matter was directed to be listed before the Joint Registrar for completion of service of the Respondents. However, the Petitioner did not take any steps to serve the Respondents as can be noticed from various orders passed by the Joint Registrar.



2. Noting the lapse on the part of the Petitioner, on 16th February, 2023, cost was imposed on them with a further direction to take steps for effecting service on the Respondents. Since then, the Petitioner has not complied with the orders of the Court by either depositing the cost or taking steps to serve the Respondents. Multiple opportunities have been granted to this effect as can be seen from various previous orders.
3. On 26th September, 2024, Mr. Abhinav Garg and Mr. Janhavi, Advocates appeared on behalf of Respondent No. 1 and accepted notice and sought time to file *vakalatnama*. Notices were directed to be issued to remaining Respondents. Yet, no *vakalatnama* was filed on behalf of Respondent No. 1, and as a result, further opportunities were given to the Petitioner to serve the Respondents. However, no steps have been taken till date. Consequently, the order dated 15th September, 2022 for completion of service of the Respondents, have not been complied till date.
4. It is further noticed that there has been no appearance on behalf of the Petitioner on 17th January, 2025 and 6th May, 2025. The position remains the same even today.
5. In light of the above, it is apparent that the Petitioner has consistently defaulted in complying with the Court's directions.
6. Accordingly, the present petitions are dismissed in default and for non-prosecution.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MAY 29, 2025

as