

LAC No. 126/19

Balbir Singh vs UOI

25.01.2021

Today, the matter has been taken up through physical hearing.

Present: Sh. Vinod Kumar, counsel for the petitioner.

Sh. A.C. Tiwari, counsel for UOI/R-1.

Sh. S.S. Mittal, counsel for DDA/R-2.

None for DSIIDC/R-2.

Petitioner and R-3 have not filed the reply to the application u/o
1 Rule 10 CPC moved by DDA/R-2.

Counsel for the petitioner and R-1 submit that they have no objection if the application is allowed. None appeared for R-3/DSIIDC. Hence, it is apparent that R-3 is not interested in contesting the application. Accordingly, in view of the forgoing submissions and on perusal of record, the application is allowed. DDA is deleted from the array of the parties. Amended memo of parties be filed within two weeks from today.

R-3/DSIIDC has not filed the WS despite given ample opportunities. Hence, it is apparent that R-3 is not interested in filing the WS. Accordingly, right of R-3/DSIIDC to file the WS stands closed.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that he does not want to file the replication to the WS of R-1. Hence, the petitioner's said right is closed.

Counsel for the petitioner admits the statement u/s 19 of LA Act.

Pleadings are complete.

Following issues are framed from the pleadings of the parties:

- 1). Whether the petitioner is entitled to enhancement in compensation, if so, to what amount?

2) Relief.

No other issue arises or pressed.

Put up for PE on 08-11-2021.

(Pankaj Gupta)
ADJ-1(North)/Delhi/25.01.2021