

Sl. 31  
09.12.2014.  
S.d.

***C O 3500 of 2014***

*Khoka Das and others*  
*-versus-*  
*Sri Manindra Das and others.*

Mr. Partha Sarathi Bhattacharyya  
Mr. Raju Bhattacharyya  
....for the petitioners.

The plaintiffs are not represented despite service.

The previous order of November 10, 2014 required the plaintiffs to show cause why the order impugned dated September 12, 2014 should not be set aside and the amendments permitted to be incorporated by such order should not be directed to be deleted.

The petitioners are some of the defendants in a partition suit and complain of the trial court allowing a particular document to be brought on record by way of amendment in September, 2014, though an identical application filed in March, 2014 for amendment of the plaint was rejected.

Since the plaintiffs do not appear to be interested in the matter and it is the petitioners' submission that the subsequent application for amendment could not have been allowed upon the original application for amendment on similar lines being rejected, CO 3500 of 2014 is allowed by setting aside the order dated September 12, 2014 and by requesting the trial court to expeditiously dispose of Title Suit No. 4 of 2013 without granting unnecessary adjournments to any of the parties, particularly on the grounds of lawyers' inconvenience or the like.

There will be no order as to costs.

Urgent certified website copies of this order, if applied for, be made available to the parties upon compliance of the requisite formalities.

(Sanjib Banerjee, J.)

