

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 01.09.2020

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

Application Nos.1813 and 1814 of 2020
in Application No.372 of 2020

Chrysalis Home Needs Pvt. Ltd.,
A Company incorporated under
the Companies Act, 1956
Represented by Gandhimathi A
1/56, Pudupakkam,
Off Kelambakkam to Vandalur Road,
Kanchipuram - 603 103.

... Applicant
[in both Applications]

versus

1.Manikandan Jayapandian

2.Big Laundry Services Pvt. Ltd.,
Registered Office at
1/56, Pudupakkam,
Off Kelambakkam to Vandalur Road,
Kanchipuram,
Tamilnadu - 603 103.

... Respondents
[in both Applications]

Common Prayer: Applications filed under Order XIV Rule 8 of Original Side Rules read with Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, to permit to pass an order allowing the applicant to implead themselves in A.No.372 of 2020 and set aside the ex-parte order dated 19.03.2020 in A.No.372 of 2020 filed by the first respondent under Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.

For Applicant : M/s.Shabnam Banu
[in both Applications]
For Respondent No.1 : Mr.Vigneshwar Elango
[in both Applications]
For Respondent No.2 : Mr.Raj Jhabakh
[in both Applications]

COMMON ORDER

These applications have been filed to implead the applicant on the ground that the Bank Account has been attached stating that they are the sister concern of the first applicant but there is no such order passed by this Court on 14.02.2020 to furnish security.

2. Though this Court has passed an order of attachment on 19.03.2020 taking note of the fact that the respondent has not furnished any security, the order came to be passed.

3. This Court also perused the case records. When the matter came up before this Court on 29.01.2020 only notice to furnish security to the respondent alone issued, returnable by 14.02.2020 and thereafter, this Court has passed the said order.

4. In such view of the matter, the order dated 19.03.2020 passed

by this Court is recalled.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the first respondent has no objection for allowing these impleading applications and hence, these applications are ordered.

6. Since the physical presence of the learned counsel for the applicant is not permitted, Registry is directed to carry out the necessary amendment in the main applications. In the meanwhile, the learned counsel for the applicant is directed to file amendment applications.

7. The first respondent is directed to file counter affidavit in the main application.

01.09.2020

sri

WEB COPY

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.

sri



Application Nos.1813 and 1814 of 2020
in Application No.372 of 2020

WEB COPY

01.09.2020