



\$~34

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

CM(M) 670/2023 & CM APPL. 20827/2023 (stay)

M/S. VICTRONICS COMMUNICATION PVT. LTD.Petitioner

Through: Ms. Muskan Nagpal, Advocate
(through videoconferencing).

versus

M/S. ATA FREIGHT LINE (I) PVT. LTD.Respondent

Through: Mr. Sushant Singhal, Advocate
(through videoconferencing).

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

ORDER

06.10.2025

%

1. At the outset, adjournment was requested by counsel for petitioner on the ground of “*personal difficulty*” of arguing counsel. The adjournment request was strongly opposed by counsel for respondent, taking me through previous record to support his contention that petitioner is deliberately protracting the proceedings. On being called upon to disclose the so-called personal difficulty, counsel for petitioner stated that arguing counsel is ill. On being asked if the stay of trial court proceedings be vacated for granting adjournment, counsel for petitioner requested for a passover awaiting the arguing counsel. It appears that adjournment request on false ground was made. However, since passover is not possible, matter is adjourned subject to the petitioner paying cost of Rs. 10,000/- to respondent through counsel within one week.

2. Relist on 23.03.2026 in Advance List.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

OCTOBER 6, 2025/dr