



\$~13

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

RFA 71/2024

SANJAY KUMAR GUPTA AND ANR Appellants

Through: Mr. Rajesh Rai (through vc) and

Mr. Rohan Rai, Advocates

versus

ANOOP MALIK

..... Respondent

Through:

CORAM: MS. KAUSHLYA VERMA, REGISTRAR

ORDER

%

24.04.2024

1. LCR has been received online.
2. As per Registry report, notice issued to respondent has been received back unserved with the remarks “left the given address”.
3. However, learned counsel for the appellants submits that vakalatnama has been filed on behalf of respondent by Mr. Madan Lal Sharma, Advocate and a digital copy of the same has been shown in the court.
4. Perusal of digital image of the purported vakalatnama makes it clear that the number of case has been mentioned as RSA 71/2024 instead of RFA 71/2024 and the parties name are also distinctively different from the present case.
5. At this stage, learned counsel for the appellants submits that the respondent is very much residing at the given address available on record, however, he is avoiding the service.
6. Learned counsel for the appellants further submits that he is



having one more address of the respondent and requests that respondent may be directed to be served through dasti mode on both the addresses, i.e. one address which is available on record and the other yet to be filed by him with the registry. Ordered accordingly.

7. On appellant's furnishing fresh address of respondent and taking steps within two weeks, issue dasti notice to respondent on both addresses, returnable on 02.09.2024.

REGISTRAR

APRIL 24, 2024

vk

S