

\$~8

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

O.M.P. (COMM) 439/2017

BHARAT ALUMINIUM COMPANY LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Dhuruv Mehta, Sr. Adv with Ms.
Ranjana roy and Mr. Krishna Keshav,
Advs.

versus

SEPCO ELECTRIC POWER CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION

..... Respondent

Through Ms. Manjula Baala and Ms. Vanshika
Mohta, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

ORDER

%

17.01.2019

I.A. No.242/2019, I.A. No.662/2019 & I.A. No.663/2019

1 These applications have been moved in the background of the fact that parties have arrived at a settlement. The compromise reached is recorded between the parties in a Settlement Agreement dated 31.12.2018 (in short 'S.A.')

2 I had issued notice in I.A. No.242/2019 on 10.01.2019, when, Mr. Mehta, learned senior counsel, who, appears for the applicant/petitioner, had indicated that the applicant/petitioner will take steps to amend the prayer clause (b) appearing in I.A. No.242/2019. It is for this reason that I.A. Nos.662/2019 and 663/2019 have been moved.

O.M.P. (COMM) 439/2017

Page 1 of 2

3 Since, counsel for the non-applicant/respondent is present in Court and says that in view of what is recorded hereinabove, no formal notice need to be issued as she has instructions to convey to the Court that the S.A. confirms to the firm understanding reached with the respondent.

4 Consequently, the amendment application i.e. I.A. No.662/2019, is allowed.

5 The remaining interlocutory applications are disposed of with a direction that the S.A. shall be taken on record and the main petition i.e. O.M.P. (COMM) 439/2017, shall be disposed of in terms of the said settlement.

6 Needless to say, parties will abide by the terms of the settlement.

O.M.P. (COMM) 439/2017

7 In view of the order passed today, in the aforementioned interlocutory applications, nothing survives in the captioned petition. The same is disposed of in terms of the S.A.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

JANUARY 17, 2019

A

O.M.P. (COMM) 439/2017

Page 2 of 2