$~87

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

\+ MAT.APP.(F.C.) 358/2024 and CM APPL. 64072/2024

PRIYA KHURANA .....Appellant

Through: Mr. Chirag Verma, Adv.

versus

ARPIT CHADHA .....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJ.AN

O R D E R

% 29.01.2026

1. As per the office report, learned counsel representing the Appellant has not taken steps to ensure completion of service of notice in the Appeal, which has been pending for the last two years.

2. Learned counsel representing the Appellant, has entered appearance and apprised the Court that he is a Proxy Counsel and, as such, is not aware of the facts of the case. Upon a query posed by this Court, he has further stated that he is unaware of the steps required to be taken by the Appellant to complete service.

3. This Court is constrained to observe that, in accordance with the framework of the Advocates Act, 1961, a Proxy Counsel, who is unaware of facts of the case cannot meaningfully assist the Court. A Counsel who enters appearance is expected to be aware, at the very list, of the prima facie case and the stage of the proceedings. It is for the future of this profession, that this Court earnestly hopes that younger members of the Bar will bestow due attention to reading the

files before entering appearance, approaching their briefs with the seriousness and preparation that the office demands.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the Appellant is, therefore, requested to study the file and the relevant provisions of law so as to render effective assistance to the Court.

5. List on 10.02.2026.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

JANUARY 29, 2026/JYH/hr