



2023.06.15.03:42:09

\$~4

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

+ **LA.APP. 140/2017**

M/S U S INDUSTRIES

..... Appellant

Through: Mr. Kartik Rai, Advocate

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ANR

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Yeeshu Jain, Advocate with
Ms. Jyoti Tyagi, Advocate for R-1
None for R-2

CORAM: SH. PAWAN KUMAR KALRA, REGISTRAR

ORDER

% **27.09.2022**

Today's Court proceedings are conducted through physical/hybrid mode.

CM APPL.3773/2022 (u/O 22 Rule 3 CPC) & CM APPL.3774/2022 (delay)

As per office report, respondent No.2 stands served through ordinary process. However, there is no appearance on behalf of said respondent No.2 despite service.

Let reply, if any, on behalf of respondent No.2 be filed within four weeks with advance copy to learned counsel for the appellant, who may file rejoinder thereto, if any, before the next date.

Page 1 of 2



It has already been stated on behalf of respondent No.1 that he does not wish to file any reply to the applications.

List again on 16.12.2022.

REGISTRAR

SEPTEMBER 27, 2022

vk

Page 2 of 2