



\$~70

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

+ **RFA 875/2024**

MANISH ABROL

....Appellant

Through: Mr. Anuj Kumar, Advocate

versus

SHASHI BHUSHAN KOHLI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amulya Dhingra and Mr.
Shivanshu Pandey, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

ORDER

12.12.2024

%

[Physical Hearing/Hybrid Hearing (as per request)]

CM APPL. 73031/2024 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

RFA 875/2024 & CM APPL. 73030/2024 (stay)

2. This is the first hearing of this appeal. Before commencement of submissions from the side of appellant, learned counsel for respondent insisted to be heard. It is pointed out by learned counsel for respondent that he had filed caveat but never received notice about this appeal. It is further explained by him that the caveat was filed with the title *Manish Kumar vs Shashi Bhushan Kohli*, which is the expected title of the appeal. But the appellant, with oblique purposes changed the title of the appeal as *Manish Abrol vs Shashi Bhushan Kohli*. Further, it is submitted by learned counsel that even the paperbook was not supplied to him. In this regard, learned counsel for respondent produced before me the speed post envelope and



pointed out that the postal charges paid on the same were Rs. 30/- only, which is not possible if the complete paperbook running into 380 pages was sent. Even thereafter, learned counsel for respondent sent email to the Registrar, Filing Section, as well as to counsel for appellant *qua* the caveat and supply of copy, which met no response. Learned counsel for appellant is unable to explain any reason for these efforts.

3. Under these circumstances, fairness expects that the entire paperbook be supplied to counsel for respondent and only thereafter, preliminary hearing shall be taken up.

4. Relist on 10.02.2025.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

DECEMBER 12, 2024/as

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)