



\$~48

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

+ **CS(COMM) 1091/2025 & I.As. 25211-16/2025**

META INTELLIGENCE PRIVATE LIMITEDPlaintiff

Through: Dr. Amit George, Mr. Ravilochan Daliparthi, Mr. Ibansara, Mr. Bhriju A. Pamidighahtam and Mr. Vaibhav Gandhi, Advocates

versus

MADHUR SINGHALDefendant

Through: Ms. Ria Yadav and Ms. Ayushi Gaur, Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

% **10.10.2025**

I.A. 25213/2025 (seeking exemption from pre-institution mediation)

1. This is an application filed by the plaintiff under Section 12A of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 ['CPC'] seeking exemption from pre-institution mediation.
2. Ms. Ria Yadav, Advocate enters appearance on behalf of the defendant on advance service.
3. Learned counsel for the plaintiff states that past one month has been spent on amicably resolving the disputes however, the parties have been unable to arrive at consensus. He states that both Mr. Anant Haldia and the defendant have been together for 15 years and this dispute is unfortunate.
4. On suggestion given by the Court, both the parties are willing to explore mediation. Accordingly, with the consent of the parties, the parties



are referred to Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre [‘Mediation Centre’].

5. The Mediation Centre is requested to appoint a Senior Mediator in this matter.

The Ld. Mediator is requested to conclude the mediation proceedings before the next date of hearing.

6. List the matter before the Mediation Centre on 15.10.2025 at 03:30 P.M.

7. Notwithstanding the aforesaid reference, this Court is otherwise satisfied that in the facts of this case, and in light of the judgment of the Supreme Court in **Yamini Manohar v. T.K.D. Keerthi¹** **there is urgency in the interim relief sought by the plaintiff** and therefore exemption from the requirement of pre-institution mediation is granted to the plaintiff.

8. With the aforesaid directions and observations, the application stands disposed of.

I.A. 25212/2025 (seeking extension of time for filing court fee)

9. This is an application filed under Section 149 CPC seeking extension of time to file court fee. Learned counsel for the plaintiff seeks one week time to deposit the Court fees certificate.

10. The application is allowed subject to the Court fees Certificate being deposited within one (1) week, failing which the plaint shall stand rejected under Order VII Rule 1(b) CPC.

11. With the aforesaid direction, the application is disposed of.

I.A. 25214/2025 (seeking time for filing the required certificate)

12. This is an application filed on behalf of the plaintiff under Section 151



of CPC seeking extension of time to file certificate under Section 63(4)(c) of the Bhartiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023 [‘BSA’] and declaration under Order 11 Rule 6(3) CPC.

13. The application is allowed subject to filing certificate under Section 63(4)(c) BSA and declaration under Order 11 Rule 6(3) of the CPC within four (4) weeks.

14. Accordingly, this application is disposed of.

I.A. 25216/2025 (seeking permission to file videos in a pen drive)

15. This is an application filed on behalf of the plaintiff under Section 151 of CPC seeking permission to file certain videos in a pen drive.

16. The plaintiff is directed to file the CD/pen-drive in accordance with the Rule 24 of the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.

17. Registry may receive electronic record on CD so long as it is encrypted with a hash value or in any other non-editable format. The video recording contained in CD be placed in the electronic record of the present suit in a format which is non-editable, so that the same can be viewed by the Court during hearing.

18. With the aforesaid directions, this application stands disposed of.

CS(COMM) 1091/2025 & I.A. 25211/2025 (for stay), I.A. 25215/2025 (for appointment of Receiver)

19. This is a suit filed by the plaintiff against the defendant for breach of fiduciary duties, disruption of business, illegal retention of company technology/data, and copyright infringement. Plaintiff seeks permanent injunction to restrain the defendant from further unlawful use of its AI-powered Real-time Interactive Digital Human Solution [‘Software’].

¹ (2024) 5 SCC 15.



20. Let the plaint be registered as a suit.
21. Issue summons.
22. Ms. Ria Yadav, enters appearance on behalf of the defendant and waives the formal service of summons.
23. The written statement must be filed within thirty (30) days from the date of receipt of the summons. The defendant shall also file affidavit of admission/denial of the documents filed by the plaintiff, failing which the written statement shall not be taken on record.
24. The plaintiff is at liberty to file replication thereto within thirty (30) days after filing of the written statement. The replication shall be accompanied by affidavits of admission/denial in respect of the documents filed by the defendants, failing which the replication shall not be taken on record.
25. It is made clear that any unjustified denial of documents may lead to an order of costs against the concerned party.
26. Any party seeking inspection of documents may do so in accordance with the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018.

Appointment of a Local Commissioner

27. Learned counsel for the plaintiff states that defendant was a Director of the Company and holds 40% shareholding in the plaintiff Company along with Mr. Anant Haldia, who holds 60% shareholding and is the other Director in the Company.
- 27.1 He states that though defendant has issued an e-mail on 10.09.2025 stating that he is resigning from all positions from the plaintiff Company, the plaintiff is willing to accept/concede that the defendant continues as a Director of the plaintiff. He reiterates that there is no dispute that defendant



has 40% shareholding in the plaintiff Company.

27.2 He states that Mr. Anant Haldia has made several attempts to amicably resolve this matter with the defendant for the past one (1) month, however, the same has not been fruitful. He states that intervention by common friends has also been unsuccessful.

27.3 He states that Mr. Anant Haldia does not dispute the contribution of the defendant in the development of the Software.

He states that the Software has already been licensed by plaintiff to a customer², whose agreement has been placed on record as Document 23 with the plaint, at page no. 211 thereof. Also, there is an impending agreement with a prospective customer WPB and securing this new customer could be a very beneficial opportunity for the Company. He states to service the existing customer and sign the agreement with the prospective customer; it has become essential for the plaintiff to regain access to the Software.

27.4 He states that defendant while leaving the plaintiff's office on 09.09.2025 has fixed a bit locker on the server, which has prohibited plaintiff's access to the Software and led to non-servicing of the existing customer as well as its inability to close the agreement with the prospective customer WPB. He states restoring the access is necessary so as to prevent existing and future losses.

27.5 He states that plaintiff will make full disclosure of the agreement executed with the prospective customer WPB and rendition all accounts to defendant for the said agreement as well as the existing agreement. He states that the existing agreement has been signed by defendant himself.



27.6 He states that notwithstanding the reference to mediation, immediate access to the Software, for providing services to its existing customer, is imperative to maintain the reputation of the Company.

28. The matter was passed over to enable learned counsel for the defendant to take instruction on the issue of restoring access of the plaintiff to the Software.

29. At second call, Ms. Ria Yadav, learned counsel for the defendant states on instructions that defendant while issuing the e-mail dated 10.09.2025 has only resigned from his executive positions and has not resigned from the directorship. She states that defendant continues to assert his rights to directorship.

29.1 She states that defendant is willing to resolve the matter amicably and also remove the bit locker so as to permit/enable plaintiff's access to the Software.

29.2 She states that the bit locker was installed only to protect the personal data of the defendant, which was available on the relevant computer. She states that the relevant computer is still kept in the premises of the plaintiff Company. She states that defendant's concern is to protect its personal data. She states that defendant will render assistance in removing the bit locker.

29.3 She states that defendant objects to the *Vakalatnama* filed by Ms. Ila Sheel, Advocate stating that since she is related to Mr. Anand Haldia, she should not represent the plaintiff.

30. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties.

31. After considering the submissions of the parties and with the consent of the parties, it is deemed appropriate to this Court to appoint **Mr. Mayank**

² M/s Aptech Limited



Sansanwal [M. No. 9899753973, E. No. D/14058/2022, Email I.D. mayanksan84@gmail.com], who is present in Court, as a Local Commissioner to visit the office of the plaintiff on 14.10.2025 at 11:30 AM to facilitate amicable meeting between Mr. Anand Haldia and the defendant so as to enable the peaceful access to the relevant computer through which the bit locker on the server has to be removed.

32. The defendant will remain present at the plaintiff's office on the said date and take appropriate steps for removing the bit locker from the server, so that the Software becomes accessible to the plaintiff for servicing its existing customer; and there is no hindrance caused to the said customer.

33. It is clarified that however, plaintiff will not use this access for entering into an agreement with its prospective customer WPB, until the next date of hearing.

34. The parties jointly agree that after the bit locker has been removed from the server, the Local Commissioner will hand over the said relevant computer to Mr. Anant Haldia, who shall hold the said relevant computer in trust and on *Superdari*.

35. The fee of the Local Commissioner is fixed as Rs. 75,000/- to be borne by the plaintiff.

36. The defendant and the Local Commissioner will remain present at the plaintiff's premises on 14.10.2025 at 11:30 A.M.

37. In view of the objection raised by the defendant, Ms. Ila Sheel, Advocate states that she will withdraw her *Vakalatnama*, without prejudice to her rights and contentions.

38. List the matter before the Court on **03.11.2025**.

39. The digitally signed copy of this order, duly uploaded on the official



website of the Delhi High Court, www.delhihighcourt.nic.in, shall be treated as a certified copy of the order for the purpose of ensuring compliance. No physical copy of order shall be insisted by any authority/entity or litigant.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J
OCTOBER 10, 2025/rhc/AM