



\$~23

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

+ **CS(COMM) 109/2024 & I.A. 2719/2024, I.A. 5182/2024,
I.A. 10870/2024, REVIEW PET. 403/2024**

SEQUOIA CAPITAL OPERATIONS LLC & ORS.Plaintiffs

Through: Ms. Priya Adlakha, Ms. Sucharu Garg
and Ms. Shilpi Sinha, Advocates for
P-1.

Mr. Rajit Ghosh and Mr. Akshay
Maloo, Advocates for P-2 and P-3.

versus

SEENE TRADER & ORSDefendants

Through: Ms. Nidhi Raman, CGSC with
Ms. Vidhi Gupta, GP and Ms. Rashi
Kapoor, Advocate for D-7/ MEITY
and D-8/ DOT.

Mr. Arjun Harkauli, Mr. Mayank
Mikhail Mukherjee, Mr. Ujjwal
Singh, Mr. Sarakshi Asarsa,
Advocates for D-9.

Mr. Tejas Karia, Ms. Swati Agarwal,
Mr. Shashank Mishra, Mr. Mohit
Singh, Ms. Akshi Rastogi and Ms.
Rithika Mathur, Advocates for D-10.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

% **28.11.2024**

REVIEW PET. 403/2024

1. This application has been filed by the defendant no.9/ National Payment Corporation of India (NPCI) seeking review of the order dated 27th September, 2024. The relevant extract of the order concerning defendant



no.9 of which review is sought is set out below:

“19. Learned counsel for the plaintiffs and the defendant no.9 submit that the aforesaid directions have been duly complied with by the defendant no.9.

20. Accordingly, a decree is passed against the defendant no.9 in terms of Prayer 65(i) to the amended plaint, which has been set out below:

“i) Direct Defendant No. 9 (NPCI), to block access to the UPI Id *ujjbb5691989920@ujjivan* of Defendant No. 1.”

21. Decree sheet be drawn up in terms of the above.”

2. Counsel appearing on behalf of the defendant no.9 submits that in terms of paragraph 19 of the aforesaid order, the requisite information has been supplied to the plaintiffs.

3. Review is sought on the ground that blocking of UPI ID is not within the purview of defendant no. 9.

4. Counsel appearing on behalf of the plaintiffs do not oppose this position.

5. Accordingly, the directions contained in paragraphs 20 and 21 of the order dated 27th September, 2024 as set out above are recalled.

6. The review petition stands disposed of.

CS(COMM) 109/2024, I.A. 2719/2024 (under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 CPC) and I.A. 5182/2024 (under Order I Rule 10 and Order VI Rule 17 of CPC)

7. In view of the order passed above, the defendant no.9 is deleted from the array of parties.

8. Amended memo of parties be filed within one (1) week.

9. In light of the aforesaid modification of the order dated 27th September, 2024, the defendant no.11/ Ujjivan Small Finance Bank Ltd. is directed to provide KYC details in respect of bank account No.



3374120040000307.

10. List on the date already fixed, i.e. 10th January, 2025.

I.A. 10870/2024 (Application filed by the plaintiff no.1 against the defendant no.5 under Order XXXIX Rule 2A CPC)

11. Ms. Priya Adlakha, Advocate appearing on behalf of the plaintiff no.1 submits that the defendant no.5/ Gname.com Pte. Ltd., which is foreign DNR has failed to comply with the order passed by this Court on 5th February, 2024.

12. Attention of this Court has been drawn to an e-mail sent on 18th March, 2024 by the defendant no.5 to the counsel for the plaintiff no.1, which suggests that the defendant no.5 does not intend to comply with the orders passed by this Court.

13. None has been appearing on behalf of the defendant no.5.

14. In these circumstances, counsel for the defendant no.7/ Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MEITY) and the defendant no.8/ Department of Telecommunications (DOT) shall take instructions with regard to proposed action that can be taken against the defendant no.5 so that orders passed by this Court are complied with.

15. An affidavit in this regard shall be filed by the defendant no.7 (MEITY) and the defendant no.8 (DOT) within four (4) weeks from today.

16. List on the date already fixed, i.e. 10th January, 2025.

AMIT BANSAL, J

NOVEMBER 28, 2024

PB