

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
 RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
 CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 2372 OF 2002

RANBIR SINGH DHANJAL Appellant (s)

VERSUS

ARUNA GUPTA & ORS. Respondent(s)

(With office report)

Date: 30/04/2009 This Appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARJIT SINGH BEDI
 HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B. SUDERSHAN REDDY

For Appellant(s) Petitioner-In-Person (NP)

For Respondent(s) Ms. Shobha, Adv.
 Mr. Mohinder Thakur, Adv.
 Mr. Munish Kumar, Adv.

M/S K.L. Mehta & Co., Adv.

Rr-Ex-Parte

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
 ORDER

The appeal is dismissed in default in terms of the signed
 order. No costs.

(Ravi P. Verma) (M.S. Negi)
 Court Master Court Master

[Signed order is placed on the file]

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 2372 OF 2002

RANBIR SINGH DHANJALAPPELLANT(S)

Versus

ARUNA GUPTA & ORS.RESPONDENT(S)

ORDER

This appeal of the year 2002 has been filed by the appellant in-
 person, who is the former husband of respondent No.1. The claim in the
 appeal is that a sum of rupees twenty two lakhs and odd, which the
 appellant claims he has spent on his wife, should be defrayed by her to

him. The plaintiff appellant claimed reliefs in the following term:

"Decree for specific performance of 1/4th share in the property Unit No.B-1-974, out of property measuring 2400 sq. yds. situated at Rajpura Road, Ludhiana and/or in the alternative for recovery of Rs.22,05,000/-"

2. The trial Court, in its judgment dated 18th September 1999, partly decreed the suit inasmuch that a decree for Rs.15,29,417.15p. was granted, though the suit qua the claim for specific performance was dismissed. The appellate Court, however, allowed the appeal and dismissed the suit in toto. This order has been affirmed by the Division Bench in a Letters Patent Appeal. The said orders have been challenged in this appeal by special leave.

.....2.

-2-

3. In the memo of parties, the appellant has given his address as under:

Ranbir Singh Dhanjal son of
Late S. Tarlochan Singh
Resident of Canada, at present residing at
205, Sector 36A, Chandigarh.

It would be clear from the memo that the address relating to Canada is indeterminate and the efforts to serve the appellant on his address in Chandigarh have remained futile. The office report shows that the notices sent have been received unserved with the remarks 'addressee left'.

4. In this view of the matter, we have no option but to dismiss the appeal in default. No costs.

.....J.
(HARJIT SINGH BEDI)

New Delhi;
April 30, 2009.

.....J.
(B. SUDERSHAN REDDY)