

11.08.2026

Present: Sh. Rachit Singh, Ld. proxy counsel for the plaintiff.  
Sh.Jai Ram Garg, ld. counsel for the defendant.

Today, fresh vakalatnama of the ld. Counsel of the plaintiffs has been filed i.e. advocate Mr. Mayank Rastogi, Mr. Ujjwal Mishra and Mr. Rachit Singh. It is further submitted by the Ld. Counsel Sh. Rachit Singh that earlier associate had been appearing in this matter on behalf of the main counsel Sh. D.K. Rastogi, however, now advocate Sh. D.K. Rastogi had been designated as a senior counsel and he cannot represent the plaintiff in this matter anymore.

On the other hand, the Ld. Counsel for the defendant has strongly objected to such conduct submitting that since the past several dates, various counsels had been appearing on behalf of the plaintiff without proper authorization or filing their own vakalatnama. It is submitted that plaintiff is habitual of such conduct in order to cause delay and has purposefully not filed proper reply to the pending interrogatories applications of the defendant.

The Court has perused the previous record. The vakalatnama of ld. Counsel of Sh. D.K. Rastogi is on record. The aforementioned counsels whose vakalatnama has been filed today, had been appearing in this matter and their presence was marked as main counsel.

The Court is of the opinion that no prejudice has been caused to either of the parties. The counsels who had been appearing previously on behalf of the plaintiff, have now filed their vakalatnama. Hence, now matter be resumed on merits.

The application of the defendant for interrogatories had already been allowed on 23.12.2025. The affidavit of the plaintiff in compliance of the order 23.12.2025 is on record.

Matter was pending at the stage of arguments. However, ld. Counsel for the plaintiff submits that the main arguing counsel is unable to appear as he is struck in traffic in Noida due to Kavar Yatra. Adjournment is requested.

The same is opposed on behalf of the defendant submitting that plaintiff is habitual of delaying this matter and previous cost also stands unpaid. However, the adjournment as requested on behalf of the plaintiff, is granted.

Last opportunity granted to argue on the issue of reply of interrogatories and non-production of original documents.

The Ld. Counsels are also not on consensus with regard to next date of hearing as the Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff seeks Monday and Tuesday and the Ld. Counsel for defendant seeks Friday.

The Court is of the opinion that suitable dates of hearing can be taken alternatively by each party.

Accordingly, be put up for arguments/consideration on 18.09.2026.

(RIYA GUHA)  
DJ-02 (W)THC:Delhi  
11.08.2026