

Emaar India Ltd.
Vs.
John James & Anr.

Appeal No. 126 of 2022

Present: Shri Aneeshh Chopra, ld. proxy counsel for Shri Shekhar Verma, Advocate, ld. counsel for the appellant.

Shri Rishab Jain, Advocate, ld. counsel for the respondent.

Ld. proxy counsel for the appellant has sought adjournment on the ground that the arguing counsel Shri Shekhar Verma, is busy before the Hon'ble High Court in connection with some other matter and he is not in a position to attend the proceedings today. An email in this regard has also been received.

However, ld. counsel for the respondent has pointed out that on the last date of hearing when the matter was adjourned, it was specifically observed that no further adjournment would be granted.

Ld. counsel for the appellant when confronted with this submissions of the ld. counsel for the respondent has stated that in fact, due to pendency of the matter, he is not in a position to attend the proceedings today and has again requested for a date.

In these circumstances, the case stands adjourned to 24.04.2023 for arguments.

However, it is again made clear that on the next date of hearing, ld. counsel for the appellant will not put up in appearance, the arguments would be heard.

Inderjeet Mehta
Member (Judicial)
Haryana Real Estate Appellate Tribunal,
Chandigarh

Anil Kumar Gupta
Member (Technical)

27.01.2023
rajni