



\$~12

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

+ **RFA 476/2023**

MADHU MANCHANDA TRADING AS P K TRADING
COMPANYAppellant

Through: Ms. Aarti Manchanda, Advocate.

versus

PICCADILY HOTELS PVT. LTD.Respondent

Through: Mrs. Vikas Jain, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

ORDER

% **16.01.2025**

[Physical Hearing/Hybrid Hearing (as per request)]

CM APPL. 31968/2023 (for condonation of delay of 461 days in filing)

1. In terms with order dated 13.05.2024, an affidavit of the authorized representative appellant company was filed, explaining the delay of 461 days in filing this appeal. Learned counsel for respondent submits that in the interest of expeditious disposal, she does not oppose this application subject to terms. The delay in filing the appeal has been explained mainly on the ground that the appellant had initially preferred a Review Petition, which got dismissed and thereafter, some time was spent in obtaining certified copies. As rightly, pointed out by learned counsel for respondent, certified copies had already been obtained earlier.

2. In view of above circumstances, the application is allowed and delay in filing the appeal is condoned subject to the appellant paying costs of Rs. 10,000/- to the respondent by the next date.



RFA 476/2023 & CM APPL. 31969/2023 (for additional evidence)

3. The appellant has assailed dismissal of money recovery suit as well as dismissal of the Review Petition. On being pointed out the provisions under Order XLIII Rule 1(w) learned counsel for appellant seeks to drop challenge to the Review dismissal order. Accordingly, prayer clause (b) of the appeal stands deleted.
4. List the appeal on 11.07.2025.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

JANUARY 16, 2025/ry

Click here to check corrigendum, if any