

\$~6

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CS(COMM) 655/2019, I.As. 16994-16995/2019
MR. ANIL RATHI

..... Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Sudhir Chandra, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Sagar Chandra, Ms. Srijan Uppal,
Ms. Jyotsna Arora, Mr. R.K.
Rajwanshi and Mr. Amit Kumar
Sharma, Advs.

versus

M/S GARG STEEL & ORS.

..... Defendants

Through: Mr. Subhash Chawla, Adv. for D-1 to
D-9
Mr. Sanjeev Sindhwani, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Tanmay Mehta and Mr. Subhas
Chawla, Advs. for D-10 & D-11.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

ORDER
% **19.12.2019**

The defendant No.20 is still unserved and defendant No.22 has refused to accept the summons / notice.

The service on defendant No.22 is deemed to be complete.

Let fresh summons / notice be issued for service on the defendant No.20, returnable on January 10, 2020.

Reply to the application under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 stated to have been filed by defendant No.11 / Sh. Shrivats Rathi was lying under objections, the same has been called from the Registry and is now placed on record.

Arguments heard in part.

To come up for further arguments on January 10, 2020.

At this stage, my attention has been drawn to an error crept in the order dated December 03, 2019, that the statement of Mr. Sanjeev Sindhwani, to the extent that the licenses have been issued to defendant Nos.1 to 4 must be read as defendant Nos.1 to 9. The error is corrected.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

DECEMBER 19, 2019/aky