



\$~7

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

+ **LA.APP. 46/2022 & CM APPL.3463/2022**

**NORTH DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION ..... Appellant**

Through: Ms. Namrata Mukim, Standing Counsel  
with Ms. Garima Jindal, Advocate  
for MCD

versus

**SH. SHYAM SUNDER & ORS. .... Respondent**

Through: Ms. Urvashi Sharma, Advocate for  
Mr. J.K. Jain, Advocate for respondent  
Nos.1 to 18, 20 to 32, 36 to 43, 45 & 46  
Mr. Vijay Pal Singh Chauhan, Advocate  
for respondent No.34  
Mr. Praveen Kumar, Advocate for  
respondent No.35  
Ms. Rini V. Tigga Adv. for Mr. Sanjay  
Kr. Pathak Adv. for respondent  
No.47/UI

**CORAM: MS. KAUSHLYA VERMA, REGISTRAR**

**ORDER**

**% 31.10.2022**

Today's Court proceedings are conducted through  
physical/hybrid mode.

As per office report, notice could not be issued to respondent  
Nos.19 and 44 as process fee was not filed by the appellant.

Page 1 of 2



Learned counsel for the appellant submits that respondent No.33 already stands deleted vide order dated 25.01.2017 before Trial Court. Learned Counsel for the appellant submits that the service on all the respondents is complete and she has also filed an affidavit of service under order 3 rule 5 CPC. However, the same is not on record learned Counsel for the appellant is directed to check with the registry and have the same placed on record before the next date.

Vide order dated 19.04.2022, the appellant was directed to deposit the remaining 25 per cent of the decretal amount within ten weeks from the date of order dated 19.01.2022. However, the said order of the Hon'ble Court has also not been complied with by the appellant.

Learned Counsel for the appellant seeks short adjournment.

As requested, re-notify on 16.11.2022.

Memo of appearance on behalf of respondent No.47 be filed within a week.

**REGISTRAR**

**OCTOBER 31, 2022**

m

Page 2 of 2