



\$~18

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

CNR No. DLHC012732122018

+ CS(COMM) 1110/2018

TABOOLA INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Mayank Mishra, Ms. Perna
Sharma & Alay Raje, Advs.

versus

ETERNO INFOTECH PVT. LIMITED

.....Defendant

Through: Mr. Siddharth Sharma & Mr.
Vishal Kapoor, Advs. with AR
Mr. Vikram Paul

CORAM:

**JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL) MR. ASHOK
KUMAR**

ORDER
20.08.2026

%

**I.A.No.22666/2026 (under Section 151 CPC filed on
behalf of the defendant for substitution of Shri Vikram
Mahesh Paul, as AR in place of Shri Abhinandan
Raghunathan)**

1. By way of captioned IA, the defendant seeks permission to substitute its new AR Mr. Vikram Mahesh Paul in place of Shri Abhinandan Raghunathan.
2. Issue notice.
3. Learned counsel for the plaintiff accepts notice of the captioned IA and submits that they do not wish to file reply. She further submits that she has no objections, if the captioned IA is allowed.



4. It is averred in the captioned IA that the previous AR of the defendant company Mr. Abhinandan Raghunathan has left the services of the defendant company and for the said reason, the defendant company wishes to change its previous AR Mr. Abhinandan Raghunathan and wishes to bring Mr. Vikram Mahesh Paul as AR of the defendant company.
5. Heard. Record perused.
6. The defendant has also filed copy of Board Resolution/Letter of Authorisation in favour of its new AR Mr. Vikram Mahesh Paul.
7. In view of the averments made in the captioned IA as well as in view of the no objection furnished by learned counsel for the plaintiff, the captioned IA is allowed.
8. Mr. Vikram Mahesh Paul is substituted as AR of the defendant company in place of its previous AR Mr. Abhinandan Raghunathan.
9. IA stands disposed of.
- I.A.No.22665/2026 (under Order XVI Rule 1 & 1A r/w Section 151 CPC filed on behalf of the defendant seeking permission to examine an additional witness)**
10. Issue notice.
11. Learned counsel for the plaintiff accepts notice of the captioned IA and submits that they do not wish to file reply. She further submits that she has no objections, if the captioned IA is allowed.
12. Heard. Record perused.
13. In view of the averments made in the captioned IA as well as in view of the no objection furnished by learned counsel for the plaintiff, the captioned IA is allowed.



14.IA stands disposed

CS(COMM) 1110/2018

15.The matter is listed for Defendant's Evidence (DE).

16.Application seeking permission to examine additional witness has been allowed today.

17.Plaintiff is directed to file evidence by way of affidavit of the witnesses within four weeks.

18.Learned counsel for the plaintiff submits that last opportunity was granted to the defendant to lead evidence in this case and the defendant has moved the abovementioned IA for today with the motive to delay the proceedings. She further submits that for the said reason, cost be imposed upon the defendant.

19.Heard. Record perused.

20.Vide order dated 23.03.2026, my learned Predecessor has specifically observed that any default on the next date of hearing resulting in wastage of time shall entail imposition of cost of not less than ₹20,000/- on the defendant.

21.Accordingly, a cost of Rs.20,000/- is imposed upon the defendant to be paid to the plaintiff.

22.List for Defendant's Evidence (DE) on **18.01.2027**.

ASHOK KUMAR
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL)
AUGUST 20, 2026/nk