



\$~10

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ RFA(COMM) 182/2026 & CM APPL. 19029/2026, CM APPL.
19030/2026, CM APPL. 19031/2026

BHUSHAN DEALMARK PRIVATE LIMITEDAPPELLANT
Through: Mr. Himanshu Garg, Advocate

versus

AMIT KUMARRESPONDENT
Through: *Nemo*

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NITIN WASUDEO SAMBRE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL

ORDER
29.04.2026

%

1. Drawing support from the Work Order dated 25th September, 2021, a copy of which was received on WhatsApp, and was placed on record along with a certificate under Section 65B of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, it is the contention of the counsel for appellant/original plaintiff that the learned Commercial Court erred in rejecting the appellant's contention that the Work Order was true. According to him, that since the document emanated from an authenticated source and was along with a certificate under Section 65B of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872, the Court ought to have accepted the same as evidence, this was not controverted by the other side as the suit proceeded *ex parte*.
2. Issue notice to the respondent, returnable in eight weeks.
3. We permit the parties to appear before the Delhi High Court Mediation



and Conciliation Centre ('**DHCM&CC**') on 11th May, 2026 at 11 am.

4. List before this Court on 6th August, 2026.

NITIN WASUDEO SAMBRE, J

AJAY DIGPAUL, J

APRIL 29, 2026/pr/sk