



\$~14

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

+ **CS(COMM) 852/2022**

M/S TEJ RAM DHARAM PAUL & ANR.

.....Plaintiff

Through: Ms. Shruti Venugopal & B.
Dhananjay, Advs.
(M- 9818558690)

versus

M/S OM SHIVA PRODUCTS INC & ORS.

.....Defendant

Through: Mr. Raghu Vinayak Sinha,
Adv. for D-1.
Mr. Manish Singhal, Advs.
for D-5 (through VC)

CORAM:

**SIDHARTH MATHUR (DHJS), JOINT REGISTRAR
(JUDICIAL)**

ORDER

08.10.2024

%

The plaintiffs have already filed the physical copies of their documents. The defendant no. 1 to 4 shall also do the same in due course.

The counsel for the defendant no. 5 states that he has filed a condonation application qua his written statement only today, which is yet to be listed. He, in the alternative, makes an oral prayer for condonation of the delay of 75 days in his written statement. He submits that the delay was caused since the service was effected on his Trademark-agent, who later informed the defendant no. 5 quite belatedly. The counsel for the plaintiffs states that the oral prayer be granted, subject to the costs. Accordingly the delay in the written statement of the defendant no. 5 is condoned, subject to the costs of Rs. 10,000/-, payable to the opposing



counsel within ten days. The written statement shall then be placed on record by the registry. Its copy be also supplied to the opposing counsel by the counsel for the defendant no. 5 during the course of the day, via email. The plaintiffs may file their replication in due course after the costs would be cleared.

List the matter for admission-denial and marking of exhibits on **08.01.2025**.

**SIDHARTH MATHUR (DHJS)
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL)**

OCTOBER 8, 2024/jr

Click here to check corrigendum, if any