



\$~11

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

+ **CM(M) 2951/2024**

BPTP LTD.

.....Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

MAJOR (RETD.) ROHITASHWA DUBEY Respondent

Through: Mr. Ajay Brahme, Advocate with
respondent in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

ORDER

%

09.10.2025

CM(M) 2951/2024 & CM APPL. 40261/2024 (stay)

1. Some counsel has opted to appear through videoconferencing on mobile phone on behalf of petitioner while being in a park. The counsel insists that she is appearing not from the park but from NCDRC, though the background is reflecting trees and bushes. Be that as it may. Counsel appearing through videoconferencing on behalf of petitioner seeks adjournment. But the adjournment request is strongly opposed by counsel for respondent stating that SCDRC is not proceeding further on account of pendency of the present petition.

2. In the above circumstances, adjournment request is allowed, making it clear that there is no stay on operation of the impugned order, so further proceedings be carried out.

3. Relist on 12.03.2026.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

OCTOBER 9, 2025/dr