

\$~5

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

+ **FAO 335/2013**

M/S INTERARCH BUILDING PRODUCTS PVT LTD

..... Appellant

Through: Mr.Ajay Shekhar, Mr.Vinayak Batta
and Mr.Pawas Agarwal, Advocates

versus

M/S TRADE CONNECTION & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VALMIKI J. MEHTA

ORDER

%

19.07.2017

Learned counsel for the appellant states that by the impugned order it was held that the courts at Delhi did not have territorial jurisdiction and therefore suit plaint was returned under Order VII Rule 10 CPC for being filed in the Court of appropriate territorial jurisdiction in Chennai. It is argued that return of plaint under Order VII Rule 10 CPC is not at the initial stage but at the stage of final arguments after evidence has been led in the suit. It is stated that to avoid prejudice, the appellant will approach the Supreme Court under Section 25 CPC to transfer the suit as a whole from the stage of final arguments to the competent Court at Chennai.

Accordingly, at request, this appeal for the time being is disposed of as not pressed with liberty to the appellant to seek appropriate order under Section 25 CPC from the Supreme Court and

in case, appellant is not successful in such proceedings then the appellant can revive this present appeal.

Appeal is accordingly disposed of for the time being.

VALMIKI J. MEHTA, J

JULY 19, 2017

rb