



\$~7

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CS(COMM) 624/2017**
PFIZER INC. & ORS Plaintiff

Through: Ms. Rashi Punia Advocate

versus

LUCIUS PHARMACEUTICALS & ORS. Defendant
Through: Mr. Parveen K. Aggarwal Advocate
for D-4
Mr. Raj Kapoor Advocate for
Proposed Defendant

CORAM:
SH. RAKESH PANDIT (DHJS), JOINT REGISTRAR
(JUDICIAL)

ORDER

% **27.08.2018**

IA No. 9375/2018 (under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC by plaintiff)

Learned counsel for the proposed defendant submits that he has not received the complete set of paper book and seeks time to file reply. Learned counsel for the plaintiff undertakes to supply the same within two days from today. Let the same be done accordingly.

CS(COMM) 624/2017

It is submitted that on the last date of hearing inadvertently, the orders appears to have been passed for defendants 1 and 2 in *IA No. 9374/2018 (under Order 5 Rule 20 CPC)* though it should have been only for defendant no.1.



Heard.

Record perused. The order should be treated as only against *defendant no.1*

The plaintiff has filed the affidavit of service.

As per office report, the citations qua defendant no.1 are awaited. Learned counsel for the plaintiff submits that the publication qua defendant no.1 has already been done at Sri Lanka but the newspapers are awaited at her office and the same shall be filed within a week.

Learned counsel for the plaintiff seeks time to ascertain the fresh address of defendant no.2.

The matter is already listed before the Hon'ble Court on 30.08.2018 and be thus placed before the Hon'ble Court for further directions on the date fixed.

SH. RAKESH PANDIT (DHJS)
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL)

AUGUST 27, 2018
hk