

CS (Comm) No. 1094-24
Ashanur Rahim Vs. Surender Kumar Tak

25.03.2025

Present:- Sh. S.S. Nizami, Ld. Counsel for plaintiff alongwith plaintiff.

Sh. Madan Sagar, Ld. Counsel for defendant no. 7 / MCD.

Sh. M. Mohtram, Ld. Counsel for proposed defendant no.6Ms. Shaila Qureshi with her husband.

Sh. Lovlesh Tak @ Timsy, LR of defendant no.1.

Ld. Counsel for proposed defendant no.6 Ms. Shaila Qureshi has filed reply to the application under Order VI Rule 17 r/w Order I Rule 10 CPC. Copy supplied.

Summons sent to the defendant no. 2 Kamal Tak at fresh address received back with the report that nothing could be known about him.

Summons sent to the defendant no. 3 Kusum Lata received back with the report that one lady namely Shivalika Singh met at the spot, who told herself daughter of defendant's sister and received the summons.

Summons sent to the defendant no. 5 Sunita Tomar received back with the report that one lady namely Shivalika Singh met at the spot, who told herself daughter of defendant and received the summons.

Sh. Lovlesh Tak submits that defendants no. 2 to 5

are his relative and he is also on behalf of defendant no. 1 to 5. He also submits that his name is Lovlesh Tak and his nick name is Timsy and not Lablesch Tak @ Pinky. He further submits that copy of the application has yet not been supplied.

Same is supplied today. Colour copy through whatsapp has also been supplied to him as well as defendant no.6.

Put up for filing reply to the application under Order VI Rule 17 CPC on **15.04.2025**. Advance copy of reply be supplied to plaintiff atleast a week prior to the next date of hearing.

(Sanjeev Kumar Aggarwal)
District Judge (Commercial Court)-01,
Central, Tis Hazari Courts,
Delhi/25.03.2025