



\$~8

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

CS(OS) 2025/2011

ESCORTS LIMITED

..... Plaintiff

Through Ms. Rekha Dwivedi, Advocate

versus

JOINT INVESTMENTS PVT LTD &8 ANR Defendants

Through Mr. Abinash Agarwal, Advocate for
D-1&D-2

CORAM:

SH. RAJESH KUMAR SINGH (DHJS), JOINT REGISTRAR

ORDER

%

12.09.2017

Affidavit tendered by PW1 towards his examination in chief. Objection of learned counsel for defendant to exhibition of the documents also recorded. Learned counsel for defendant submits that the documents which are photocopies and original of which have not been produced should be marked and not exhibited. Heard. Marking of a document does not amount to proof. Marking is done to identify the document. Giving exhibit number on the photocopy will not mean that the document has been proved. Giving mark numbers to documents at this stage will create confusion. Therefore, exhibit numbers are retained as mentioned in the affidavit of the witness and documents are exhibited subject to objection taken by learned counsel for defendants. Regarding the document Ex.PW1/18, learned counsel for plaintiff submits that due to typographical error in the affidavit, the date of the document was mentioned as 11.12.2013 instead of the



correct date i.e. 11.12.2003 and the document which is already on record has been exhibited.

Learned proxy counsel for defendants No. 1 and 2 submits that the witness has to be cross examined by Mr. Shalabh Singhal, learned counsel for defendant but he is not available today due to personal difficulty. Learned proxy counsel for defendants has also explained the personal difficulty of learned counsel for defendant.

List on 18th January, 2018 for PE.

RAJESH KUMAR SINGH (DHJS)
JOINT REGISTRAR

SEPTEMBER 12, 2017

ms