



\$~90

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

+ **W.P.(C) 924/2010**

ANIL KUMAR ARYA & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr.Anshuman Mehrotra, Advocates
for P-1 to 7, 9 to 15,17,19 to 21, 23 to
31, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 42, 44, 45, 52,
54 to 57, 60, 62, 65, 66, 68 to 72, 77,
78, 81 to 88, 90 to 97,99 to 101,103
to 113, 115, 119, 120 to 127, 129 to
138,143 to 173 & LRs of P-98, 102 &
120.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Anjana Gosain, Mr. Anuj Kumar
and Mr. Keshav Raheja, Advocates
for R-1 & 2.
Mr. Civyanshu Singh, Advocate for
respondents Nos. 3 to 5.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

%

30.04.2025

CM APPL. 25628/2025

By way of the present application filed under Order I Rule 10
read with section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908, 21
petitioners as per the details contained in this application, seek
deletion from the array of parties in the present proceedings.

2. Affidavits of all the petitioners who have sought deletion have been
filed in support of the application.



3. For the reasons stated in the application, which is duly supported by the respective affidavits of the applicants, it is not considered necessary to issue notice on the application.
4. The application is allowed.
5. The petitioners, as per details set-out in para 3 of the application, are deleted from the array of parties in the present proceedings.
6. Let Amended Memo of Parties be filed by learned counsel appearing for the other petitioners within 02 weeks.
7. The application is disposed-of.

W.P.(C) 924/2010

8. Mr. Anshuman Mehrotra, learned counsel appearing for other petitioners submits that they hold *vakalatnama* for some of the petitioners, as per details contained in 'List-1' of document dated 26.04.2025 handed-up in court today.
9. Document dated 26.04.2025 is taken on record.
10. Mr. Mehrotra however submits, that insofar as the 20 petitioners who are set-out in 'List-3' of the said document are concerned, he does not hold *vakalatnama* for those petitioners; nor does he have any information about the current whereabouts/addresses of the said petitioners.
11. Counsel draws attention to order dated 28.07.2023, to submit that by reason of the then counsel Mr. Shashank Shekhar (who was initially representing all 177 petitioners) informing the court that he represents only 136 petitioners and not the other petitioners, the court had directed issuance of court notice to the petitioners who were not represented by Mr. Shekhar.



12. Subsequently, *vide* order dated 08.10.2024 it was observed that since there was no appearance on behalf of the other petitioners, if they remained unrepresented on the next date of hearing, the petition would be dismissed insofar as they were concerned.
13. In the circumstances, counsel submits, that the court may pass appropriate orders, since the present petition has been pending since 2010.
14. However, this court is of the view that before dismissing the petition insofar as the petitioners mentioned in 'List-3' of document dated 26.04.2025 are concerned, it would be appropriate that court notice be issued them, on the addresses and particulars as contained in the original Memo of Parties.
15. Let the court notice indicate that if the said petitioners remain unrepresented despite service of that notice, the petition would be dismissed insofar as they are concerned.
16. Re-notify before the learned Joint Registrar for service of court notice on 28th July 2025, the date already fixed.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

APRIL 30, 2025

V.Rawat