



\$~6

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CS(OS) 927/2013 & IA No.15258/2013 (u/O XXIII R-3 CPC)
ANKUR BALI Plaintiff
Through: Mr. Amit Sanduja, Adv.
Versus
MADHU Defendant
Through: Mr. Vipin Chaudhary, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

% **26.07.2019**

1. This suit is listed in terms of order dated 23rd January, 2019, for monitoring the evidence.
2. None appears for the plaintiff.
3. The counsel for the defendant states that the counsel for the plaintiff was not available on the last date before the Commissioner appointed for recording of evidence and no further date has been given by the Commissioner.
4. At this stage, the counsel for the plaintiff has appeared and has no satisfactory explanation for his non-appearance before the Commissioner. Again, the oft taken ground, of “main counsel” being in difficulty is taken.
5. The main counsels are found to be neither appearing in this Court nor before the Commissioner appointed for recording evidence. If any of the parties / counsels default on any date before the Commissioner, the right of that party shall stand closed.
6. The parties to, within four weeks, in consultation with the Commissioner, resume recording of evidence.
7. List on 27th November, 2019.

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J.

JULY 26, 2019/‘bs’..