

\$~15

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CS(COMM) 890/2018**
CHRISTIAN LOUBOUTIN SAS Plaintiff
Through: Ms. Udit M. Patro, Adv.
Versus
ABUBAKER & ORS Defendants
Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

%

10.02.2020

IA No.1391/2020 (of the plaintiff under Order VI Rule 17 CPC for amendment of the suit)

1. No such application lies after the suit has been disposed of.
2. The application is dismissed.

CS(COMM) 890/2018

3. The remedy of the plaintiff, for the error which has occurred in the plaint, is to apply for correction of the judgment and decree, even though owing to the error in the plaint.
4. It is pointed out that in the order dated 13th August, 2019 disposing of the suit, the plaintiff has been held to be entitled to a decree for permanent injunction as claimed in prayer paragraph 54(a),(b) and (c) of the plaint dated 16th May, 2018, but in paragraph 54(a) of the plaint, the paragraph of the plaint containing a description of the trade marks of the plaintiff has been erroneously mentioned as paragraph 21, though the description is in paragraph 20 of the plaint.
5. The order dated 13th August, 2019 and the decree in terms thereof be read / be drawn up, as if referring to the trade marks in paragraph 20, instead of paragraph 21 of the plaint.

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J

FEBRUARY 10, 2020/‘gsr’