



\$~3

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

LA.APP. 53/2019

SANJEEV RANA & ORS

..... Appellant

Through: Mr. Rishabh Mann, Advocate

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Manisha, Advocate for Mr. Yeeshu

Jain, Advocate for respondent No.1

Mr. Prateek Dahiya, Advocate for
respondent Nos.2 to 6

Ms. Pavitra and Ms. Sudeshna Singh,
Advocates for respondent No.9

Ms. Anjali Chauhan and Mr. Anand

Amit, Advocates for respondent No.32

CORAM: MR. PAWAN KUMAR KALRA, REGISTRAR

ORDER

%

07.12.2022

CM APPL.17853/2019

As per office report, respondent Nos.1, 7 and 9 stand served through ordinary process whereas notice issued to respondent No.34 has been received back unserved with the remarks “incomplete address”.

Respondent No.37 is reported to have died.

Mr. Prateek Dahiya, Advocate for respondent Nos.2 to 6 submits that respondent No.2 has since died and he would furnish the details of LRs of deceased respondent No.2 to learned counsel for the appellant within a week. Let him do so.

Page 1 of 2



On appellant furnishing fresh/correct address of respondent No.34, issue fresh notice to respondent No.34, by all permissible modes, returnable on 14.03.2023.

Learned counsel for the appellant to also take necessary steps for substitution of LRs of deceased respondent Nos.2 and 37 before the next date.

REGISTRAR

DECEMBER 7, 2022

vk

Page 2 of 2