



SA-110 of 1998

29.11.2023
Item no.01
Court No.50

Gour Mohan Mondal & Ors.
Vs.
Harendra Nath Halder

Ld. Advocate Mr. Gautam Das appears for the appellant.

Ld. Counsel for the appellant submits that thrice the notice of appeal have been served upon the respondents. But, respondents are avoiding service of notice of appeal deliberately and accordingly the Ld. Counsel has prayed for substituted service of notice of appeal upon the respondent nos. 7(c)(ii), 16(ga)(A-C), 16(uma)(A-B), 17(b-d) as stated in Paragraph 9 of the petition.

Perused the office report dated 23.11.2023.

It transpires from the office report that the appellant has filed an application being CAN 26/23 on 18.10.2023 for causing substituted service of notice appeal upon the respondent nos.7(c)(ii), 16(ga)(A-C), 16(uma)(A-B), 17(b-d).

It further transpires from the office report that notice of appeal were issued previously upon the said respondents without any effect. Thereafter, the appellants could not collect the proper address to cause further attempt to serve notices upon the respondents.

It emerges from the case record that CAN 26/23 has been filed thereby praying for substituted service of notice of appeal being



SA 110/1998 upon the respondent nos.
7(c)(ii), 16(ga)(A-C), 16(uma)(A-B), 17(b-d).

It is apparent from the office report that for several time attempts have been made on behalf of the appellant to serve notice of appeal to the respondents without any effect.

Hence, the prayer of the appellant is allowed. The appellant is hereby directed to file substituted service of notice of appeal upon the respondent nos. 7(c)(ii), 16(ga)(A-C), 16(uma)(A-B), 17(b-d) in accordance with law.

(Nabanita Ray)
Registrar Administration (L&OM)