

SMT RANJEET KAUR @ RANJIT KAUR Vs. THE STATE

11.04.2023

Present: Sh. B.P. Vaishnav and Ms Birjesh Sharma, ld. Counsels for the petitioner alongwith petitioner in person.

Sh. Arun Nischal, ld. Counsel for R-3, 4, 5 & 7 ((A)(B) & (C).

On the first call, son of the petitioner had appeared and submitted that settlement talks between the petitioner and respondents were going on. He had further informed the court that rejoinder to the objections filed on behalf of R-3, 4, 5 & 7(a, b & c) would be filed today. However since the counsel for the petitioner was not present, pass over was sought. On the matter being called again, rejoinder has been filed, and copy has been supplied to ld. Counsel for R-3, 4, 5 & 7(a,b & c). It needs a highlight that R-2 a and 2b were served on 8.11.2022 but despite service no appearance has been put in on their behalf, consequently they are proceeded against ex-parte.

Respondent no. 6 for service of whom dasti summons had been issued, has also been served by way of e-mail. The service has been effected on the son of R-6. It needs a highlight that R-6 could not be served by way of summon sent through registered post and the same was returned with the endorsement that 'despite repeated visits the addressee could not be found'. It was in view of the report on the R.C. that counsel for the petitioner had sought permission to R-6 through e-mail, as noted in the last order. The matter is stated to be under settlement out side the Court.

Contd. 2

-2-

The concerned SDM is directed again to file the valuation report on or before the next date of hearing and to seek police aid in case there is any objection to the inspection of the property by the staff of the office of SDM/concerned Tehsildar.

Put up on 02.08.2023 for framing of issues.

(Ajay Gulati-I)
ADJ-02, WEST
11.04.2023