



\$~19

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

+ TEST.CAS. 101/2011

ANIL NARENDRA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. S. K. Sharma, Adv.
with Mr. Tejas Singh and
Mr. Saurabh Dagar, Adv.
(through VC)

versus

STATE & ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Atul Kumar, Adv.
for R-2 (M:9560960020)

CORAM:
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL) SH. GAGANDEEP
JINDAL (DHJS)

ORDER

19.09.2025

%

Proceedings are being conducted through hybrid mode.

I.A.No.20759/2025 (by respondent no.2 u/S 151 CPC r/w
Chapter 3 Rule 6 of Delhi High Court seeking
permission to appear for cross examination via video
conferencing)

1. Heard.
2. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner submits that he has no objection if the evidence of respondent no. 2 be recorded through Video Conferencing.
3. Considering the submissions made in the application the captioned IA and the no objection of the Ld. Counsel for the petitioner, the captioned IA for recording the evidence of respondent no.2 through video conferencing is allowed.
4. However, it is not possible for the undersigned to record the evidence of respondent no.2 through video conferencing due to difference in time zone of India and Canada.
5. Ld. Counsel for respondent no. 2 sought some time to move



appropriate application for appointment of Local Commissioner and remote coordinator for recording the evidence of respondent no.2 through video conferencing.

6. The modalities for recording the evidence of respondent no.2 through video conferencing can only be set out only after the appointment of Local Commissioner and remote coordinator for recording the evidence of respondent no. 2 through video conferencing.
7. The captioned IA is disposed off accordingly.

TEST.CAS. 101/2011

8. The present matter is listed today for recording evidence of respondent no.2.
9. Re-notify for examination of respondent no.2 on **16th December, 2025.**

GAGANDEEP JINDAL (DHJS)
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL)
SEPTEMBER 19, 2025/PU

Click here to check corrigendum, if any