

i K Dave Vs. State of Gujarat and 2

i K Dave Vs. State of Gujarat and 2

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/921545

Court : Gujarat

Decided On : Oct-03-2011

Appellant : i K Dave

Respondent : State of Gujarat and 2

Advocate for Pet/Ap. : Mr. Pathak

Judgement :

BODY {SCROLLBAR-FACE-COLOR: #d4d0c8; SCROLLBAR-HIGHLIGHT-COLOR: #808080; SCROLLBAR-SHADOW-COLOR: #d4d0c8; SCROLLBAR-ARROW-COLOR: #ffffff; scrollbar-dark-shadow-color: #ffffff}

SPAN.searchword { background-color:yellow; }

function loadSearchHighlight()

{

var chkParamC = "txtSearch"

if (chkParamC == "txtSearch")

```
{  
  
SearchHighlight();  
  
document.searchhi.h.value = searchhi_string;  
  
if( location.hash.length > 1 ) location.hash = location.hash;  
  
}  
  
}
```

Print

</p>

SCA/8789/19942/20ORDER

IN

THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL

CIVIL APPLICATION No. 8789 of 1994

=====

I

K DAVE - Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE

OF GUJARAT & 2 - Respondent(s)

=====

Appearance

:

MR

RC PATHAK for

Petitioner(s) : 1,
MR NJ SHAH, LD.ASST.GOVERNMENT PLEADER for

Respondent(s) : 1,
MR HS MUNSHAW for Respondent(s) : 2,
RULE

SERVED for Respondent(s) :

3,

=====

CORAM HONOURABLE

:

MR.JUSTICE KS JHAVERI

Date

: 03/10/2011

ORAL

ORDER

1. When

present petition came up for hearing on 17th June 2010,

this Court passed the following order :

“Mr.

Pathak, learned counsel for the petitioner, requests for time to produce on record the affidavit-in-rejoinder.

It

may be noted that earlier also, time was granted to Mr. Pathak to produce on record the same. However, even today, time is sought on

the same ground.

In

view of the above, S.O to 09.07.2010, on condition that an amount of Rs.250/- is deposited with the Gujarat High Court Advocates' Law Library before the next date of hearing and the receipt thereof is produced on record of this Court.”

2. Thereafter,

again on 13th December 2010, this Court passed the following order :

“None

appears for the petitioner when the matter is called out for the second time.

List

on 24.03.2011.”

3. Today

also when the matter was called out, Mr.R.C. Pathak, learned advocate for the petitioner, is neither present nor has he made any mentioning. Hence, the present petition stands dismissed for default. Rule is discharged with no order as to costs.

(K.S.

Jhaveri, J)

Aakar

[Top](#)

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com