

RFA No. 204 of 2015

21.4.2016. Present: Ms. Ranjana Chauhan, Advocate, proxy counsel, for the appellants.

Notices issued to respondents No. 15 and 21 have been received back unserved. Though, in so far as these respondents are concerned, it is stated that notices were affixed on their houses, but the same cannot be considered to be a valid service as there is no order passed by this Court regarding affixation. Notice issued to respondent No.23 received back unserved with the report that she is not residing on the given address. Let the appellants take fresh steps for service of respondents No. 15, 21 and 23 within a week and thereafter issue notices to these respondents returnable on **27.5.2016**.

CMP No. 2569 of 2016

The appellants have sought deletion of the name of respondent No.50 from the array of the respondents. The application is allowed subject to all just exceptions. Application stands disposed of.

**(Tarlok Singh Chauhan),
Judge.**

**April 21, 2016.
(GR)**