

\$~22, 23 & 24

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

+ O.M.P. (COMM) 448/2017

GET POWER LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ankit Sibbal with Mr. Himanshu
Singh, Advocates.

versus

POWER GRID CORPORATION OF INDIA LTD. Respondent

Through: Mr. Arvind Varma, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Aditi Mohan, Mr. Shantnu
Aggarwal and Ms. Sawnit Jawa,
Advocates.

+ O.M.P. (COMM) 449/2017

GET POWER LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ankit Sibbal with Mr. Himanshu
Singh, Advocates.

versus

POWER GRID CORPORATION OF INDIA LTD. Respondent

Through: Mr. Arvind Varma, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Aditi Mohan, Mr. Shantnu
Aggarwal and Ms. Sawnit Jawa,
Advocates.

+ O.M.P. (COMM) 450/2017

GET POWER LTD.

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ankit Sibbal with Mr. Himanshu
Singh, Advocates.

versus

POWER GRID CORPORATION OF INDIA LTD. Respondent

Through: Mr. Arvind Varma, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Aditi Mohan, Mr. Shantnu
Aggarwal and Ms. Sawnit Jawa,
Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER
% **28.01.2019**

I.A. No.1356/2019 in O.M.P. (COMM.) 448/2017
I.A. No.1355/2019 in O.M.P. (COMM.) 449/2017
I.A. No.1357/2019 in O.M.P. (COMM.) 450/2017

1. On the last occasion, i.e., 19.09.2018, Mr. Ankit Sibbal, who, appears for the petitioner, had sought discharge on the ground that he had no instructions on behalf of the petitioner. Accordingly, Court notice was issued to the petitioner.

2. I am told that thereafter, applications for discharge were filed on 14.01.2019, which, however, were placed under objections. After removing the objections, the applications were re-filed today i.e. 28.01.2019, vide diary Nos. 102861, 102862 and 102863. These applications have been numbered.

3. As prayed, the applications are allowed. Counsel for the petitioner is discharged.

4. Accordingly, the captioned applications shall stand disposed of.

O.M.P. (COMM) No. 448/2017 & IA No. 15071/2017
O.M.P. (COMM) No. 449/2017 & IA No. 15075/2017
O.M.P. (COMM) No. 450/2017 & IA No. 15079/2017

5. As is evident from what is noted hereinabove, Court notice was issued to the petitioner in the captioned matters. Despite service there has been no appearance on behalf of the petitioner. Accordingly, the captioned petitions and applications are dismissed for non-prosecution.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J.

JANUARY 28, 2019
hs/VKR