



WEB COPY



A.Nos.3239 & 4934 of 2024
in C.S.(Comm.Div.) No.193 of 2023

SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY,J

By these two applications, the plaintiff seeks condonation of 147 days delay in re-presenting the reply statement and also seeks permission to file the same. In the affidavit in support of these applications, the plaintiff states that the reply statement was e-filed on 08.12.2023 and that a hard copy thereof was submitted on 14.12.2023. As regards the necessity for filing the reply statement, it is stated that the defendant has pleaded new facts and has also raised an objection with regard to the person representing the plaintiff as agent.

2. Learned counsel for the defendant states that these applications are belated and that even the proof affidavit was filed by the defendant.



WEB COPY



SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY, J

rna

3. The admitted position is that a copy of the reply statement was served on the defendant in December 2023. This was prior to the filing of the proof affidavit by the defendant. In these circumstances, no prejudice would be caused to the defendant. Upon examining the reasons set out in the affidavits in support of these applications and being satisfied that sufficient cause is shown, these applications are allowed as prayed for and the Registry is directed to receive the reply statement of the plaintiff.

25.09.2024
(1/2)

rna

A.Nos.3239 & 4934 of 2024
in C.S.(Comm.Div.) No.193 of 2023