

DEEPAK MANCHANDA Vs. A. P. SEHGAL AND ORS**03.09.2024**

Present: Ms. Anjum Nazz, Ld. Counsel for plaintiff.

Sh. Pranav Kanti, Ld. Counsel for defendant no. 1 to 3 through videoconferencing.

Defendant no. 2 in person.

Affidavit of defendant no. 2 Ms. Neetu Sejwal for evidence and application under Order 7 rule 11 CPC on behalf of defendant no. 1 and 2 has been filed online. Hard copy is placed on file today. Copy is supplied to Ld. Counsel for plaintiff.

Ld. Counsel for defendant no. 1 to 3 is present through videoconferencing and stated the witness is competent to examine herself and can exhibit her documents. Witness is unable to tender her affidavit and to mark the documents. The counsel for defendant no. 1 to 3 has left the hearing. Seeing that witness is not able to tender her affidavit for evidence, she is asked to call the counsel but none has appeared to assist her for her deposition till 01:00 pm. She prayed for adjournment.

Considering the facts of the case, put up on **28.11.2024** for examination of defendant no. 2.

Plaintiff be compensated with a cost of Rs. 3000/- by defendant no. 2 on account of adjournment of the matter today.

(SUNIL CHAUDHARY)
DJ-04/North-West
RHC/Delhi 03.09.2024