



WEB COPY

O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: **21.08.2024**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **M.SUNDAR**

and

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE **K.GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI**

O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

&

C.M.P.No.16667 of 2024

in

O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

Mansarowar Ispat (India) Pvt. Ltd.,
Rep. by its Director Mr.Girish Kumar Sontholia
157E, 157U, 158A, 157UU, IDA
Kothur Mandal Mahaboobnagar District
Telangana -509 228 .. Appellant

Vs.

M/s. Prakash Ferrous Industries Private Limited
Represented by its Director - Mr.Pulkit Garg
No.36, First Floor, New Avadi Road
Kilpauk Garden Colony, Kilpauk
Chennai - 600 010 .. Respondent

Original Side Appeal filed under Section 13 (1A) of
Commercial Courts Act, 2015 to set side the order passed in C.S
(Comm.Div.) No.1 of 2024 dated 05.06.2024.

For Appellant : Mr.G.Ramesh
along with Ms.N.Hansika

For Respondent : Mr.K.Premchandrar
along with Ms.Scarlet Grey



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

JUDGMENT

WEB COPY

(Judgment of the Court was delivered by **M.Sundar, J.**)

Captioned 'Original Side Appeal' ['OSA' for the sake of brevity] is directed against an *ex parte* 'judgment and decree dated 05.06.2024 made in C.S (Comm.Div.) No.1 of 2024' [hereinafter 'impugned judgment and decree' for the sake of convenience and clarity].

2. One 'Prakash Ferrous Industries Private Limited' [hereinafter 'PFIPL' for the sake of brevity] filed a suit against one 'Mansarowar Ispat (India) Pvt. Ltd.,' [hereinafter 'MIPL' for the sake of brevity] seeking *inter-alia* injunctive reliefs as regards Trade Marks 'TIRUMALA' and/or 'TIRUMALA GOLD' with usual prayers for accounts, delivery of alleged offending material and costs. This suit, for convenience can be referred to as a 'typical Trade Mark suit'.

3. Complaint of PFIPL is dated 20.11.2023 but it was presented in the Commercial Division of this Court only on 08.12.2023. Therefore, the date of presentation of suit is 08.12.2023 but the date of institution of suit is not readily available. However, the first listing before the Commercial Division i.e., first listing of the suit along with two interlocutory (injunction) applications thereat (O.A.Nos.5 and 6 of 2024) was on 04.01.2024. To be noted, O.A.No.5 of 2024 is for an interim



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

injunction i.e., interlocutory order qua alleged infringement and O.A.No.6 of 2024 is for interim injunction i.e., interlocutory order qua alleged passing off.

4. On 04.01.2024, notice in the afore-referred interlocutory applications was ordered and on being served with notice, MIPL, the sole defendant entered appearance through counsel and vakalatnama given by MIPL to its counsel is dated 29.01.2024. There is no dispute that counsel for MIPL (sole defendant) got the vakalatnama noted by counsel for plaintiff (PFIPL) on 29.01.2024 itself. However, the vakalatnama was filed in the Registry only on 14.02.2024. Thereafter, the aforementioned two interlocutory applications i.e., O.A.Nos.5 and 6 of 2024 came to be disposed of i.e., closed by the Commercial Division in and by an order dated 05.04.2024 *inter alia* saying that granting of the interlocutory reliefs sought would tantamount to granting reliefs in the main suit itself. After 05.04.2024, MIPL filed written statement dated 20.04.2024 and this written statement, according to the official website of this Court, has been e-filed by MIPL on 23.04.2024. There is no dispute that counsel for plaintiff (MIPL) was favoured with a copy of the written statement. In such a scenario, on 26.04.2024, Hon'ble Commercial Division made an order in the main suit saying that written



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

statement has not been filed, defendant is set *ex parte*, there was a further direction to list the matter before learned Master on 29.04.2024 and there was another further directive to list the matter before Commercial Division on the very next day i.e., 30.04.2024 'FOR JUDGMENT'. *Ex parte* evidence was let in before learned Master (MIPL did not get an opportunity to cross-examine the deponent i.e., PW1 and Exs.P1 to P23 were marked). Thereafter, on 05.06.2024, the impugned judgment and decree (*ex parte* judgment) came to be made.

5. Assailing the impugned judgment and decree (*ex parte* judgment) MIPL, the lone defendant is on appeal vide captioned OSA before this 'Commercial Appellate Division' ['CAD']. To be noted, captioned OSA is obviously an intra-court appeal *inter alia* under Section 13 of 'The Commercial Courts Act, 2015 [Act 4 of 2016]' [hereinafter 'CCA' for the sake of brevity].

6. In the hearing today, Mr.G.Ramesh along with Ms.N.Hansika of M/s.Mission Legal (Law Firm) for the appellant i.e., lone defendant before the Commercial Division (MIPL) and Mr.K.Premchandrar along with Ms.Scarlet Grey of M/s.Anand and Anand (Law Firm) for the lone respondent i.e., plaintiff before Commercial Division (PFIPL) are before us.



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

7. For the sake of convenience, we are setting out the details of dates and events in the form of a tabulation infra:

<i>Sl.No.</i>	<i>Description/Event</i>	<i>Date</i>
1	Date of Complaint	20.11.2023
2	Date of presentation of complaint	08.12.2023
3	Date of first listing of infringement suit (C.S (Comm.Div.) No.1 of 2024) before Commercial Division along with two interlocutory applications	04.01.2024
4	Issuance of notice in interlocutory applications	04.01.2024
5	Vakalatnama given by MIPL	29.01.2024
6	Date of filing of Vakalatnama	14.02.2024
7	Disposal of Interlocutory applications by Commercial Division	05.04.2024
8	Date of Written Statement	20.04.2024
9	Date of e-filing of Written statement	23.04.2024
10	Order of Commercial Division setting the defendant ex parte	26.04.2024
11	By 26.04.2024 order directed to be listed before learned Master for recording ex parte evidence	29.04.2024
12	By 26.04.2024 order directed to be listed before Commercial Division 'FOR JUDGMENT'	30.04.2024
13	Date of passing of impugned <i>ex parte</i> judgment and decree	05.06.2024
14	Captioned OSA presented in this CAD on	23.07.2024

8. Before we proceed further with the legal drill at hand, we deem it appropriate to record that the facts and dates i.e., events which unfurled before the Commercial Division which have been captured supra



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

by us is not subjected to any disputation or contestation as between the two sets of counsel before us. In other words, the dates, events and facts are undisputed dates, events and facts.

9. Mr.G.Ramesh of M/s. Mission Legal (Law Firm) submits that while the sole defendant MIPL has filed written statement dated 20.04.2024 on 23.04.2024 itself, the impugned judgment and decree i.e., *ex parte* judgment ought not to have been made. On a demurrer, learned counsel submits that even a party who/which does not file written statement has the right of cross-examination qua evidence that is let in on the plaintiff's side. It was also pointed that 'the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act V of 1908)' [hereinafter 'CPC' for the sake of brevity] as amended by CCA vide Section 16 read with the Schedule thereat provides for written arguments before oral arguments and that right has also been taken away (though MIPL has e-filed written statement on 23.04.2024 well within the prescribed time frame) as the 26.04.2024 order alluded to supra directs listing before learned Master on 29.04.2024 and further directs listing under the caption 'FOR JUDGMENT' before Commercial Division on the very next day i.e., 30.04.2024.

10. Mr.K.Premchandrar, learned counsel of M/s.Anand & Anand (Law Firm) made submission to the contrary. Learned counsel



11. To be noted, notwithstanding myriad grounds raised in the memorandum of grounds of appeal, the captioned OSA was argued on the aforementioned short point. It is also to be noted that main OSA was taken up with the consent of learned counsel on both sides and heard out on the aforementioned short point.

12. After carefully considering the submissions made on both sides, we are of the considered view that the impugned judgment and decree has to be set aside and the matter has to be sent back to Hon'ble Commercial Division for trial on merits and for reasons that have been set out infra as an adumbration. To be noted, in the adumbration of reasons we are rolling into one, the point, discussion on the same and dispositive reasoning point wise. The adumbration is as follows:

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>
7/23



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

WEB COPY

of CCA, with this prefatory observation, we carefully considered the dates and events i.e., chronology of what has unfurled qua trajectory the matter has taken. There is no dispute or disagreement or contestation before us that suit summons has not been served on the sole defendant, namely MIPL (appellant before us), but from the date of service of suit summons on the defendant, the defendant has 30 days to file written statement, vide amended Order VIII Rule 1 as amended by Section 16 of CCA read with Schedule thereunder, there is a further tolerance period of 90 days i.e., delay in filing written statement can be condoned upto 90 days thereafter. In effect, there is a total of 120 days. We are acutely conscious that even one day delay beyond 120 days is not condonable and that this principle has been emphatically, unambiguously and categorically laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***SCG Contracts (India) Private Limited Vs. K.G.Chamankar Infrastructure Private Limited and others*** reported in ***(2019) 12 SCC 210***. In the case on hand, the sole respondent MIPL got the vakalatnama noted on 29.01.2024 by counsel for plaintiff i.e., PFIPL and counsel for



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

WEB COPY

PFIPL before us who was counsel for PFIPL before Commercial Division also does not dispute this. The two applications O.A.Nos.5 and 6 of 2024 came to be disposed of on 05.04.2024 and therefore the plaintiff could have served the suit summons on the sole defendant by resorting to Order IV Rule 7 sub-rule (3) of the Original Side Rules of this Court, which reads as follows:

'Order IV -INSTITUTION OF ORDINARY SUITS AND SERVICE OF SUMMONS

R.7 (1).....

(2)

(3)Notwithstanding anything contained in Order V of the code for the service of summons, where an advocate has entered appearance in an interlocutory proceeding, service of summon in the suit may be made on the advocate on behalf of the party.'

The above has not been done. To be noted, the 05.04.2024 order as placed before us does not mention about the counsel who were before the Court and both learned counsel, who are before us, very fairly submitted that both counsel i.e., counsel for plaintiff/applicant (PFIPL) and counsel for defendant / respondent (MIPL) were before the Commercial Court and the



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

applications were disposed of on 05.04.2024 after contest.

WEB COPY

Therefore, technically as the sole defendant has not been served with suit summons, the clock has not started ticking and the calendar has not started moving qua the defendant with regard to the 30 days and further 90 days available to the defendant for filing written statement. However, we find that on a extreme demurrer, even if 05.04.2024 is taken as the reckoning date, on a hypothetical assumption that applicant/plaintiff has resorted to Order IV Rule 7 sub-rule (3) on 05.04.2024, the written statement has been filed within 30 days therefrom i.e., on 23.04.2024. Therefore, an *ex parte* judgment could not have been made;

(ii) The next point turns on the filing of the written statement. We find that the official website of this Court reads as follows:



WEB COPY



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

Sl. No.	Name of Litigant	The Court	uploaded on	Status
Case Number: C.A. 504815 of 2024				
1	Manoj Kumar (Plaintiff) vs. The Defendant	ADDITIONAL JUDGE	20-04-2024	Scanned
2	Manoj Kumar (Plaintiff) vs. The Defendant	ADDITIONAL JUDGE	20-04-2024	Submitted
3	Manoj Kumar (Plaintiff) vs. The Defendant	ADDITIONAL JUDGE	20-04-2024	Scanned
4	Manoj Kumar (Plaintiff) vs. The Defendant	ADDITIONAL JUDGE	20-04-2024	Submitted
5	Manoj Kumar (Plaintiff) vs. The Defendant	ADDITIONAL JUDGE	20-04-2024	Scanned
6	Manoj Kumar (Plaintiff) vs. The Defendant	ADDITIONAL JUDGE	20-04-2024	Submitted
7	Manoj Kumar (Plaintiff) vs. The Defendant	ADDITIONAL JUDGE	20-04-2024	Scanned
8	Manoj Kumar (Plaintiff) vs. The Defendant	ADDITIONAL JUDGE	20-04-2024	Submitted
9	Manoj Kumar (Plaintiff) vs. The Defendant	ADDITIONAL JUDGE	20-04-2024	Scanned
10	Manoj Kumar (Plaintiff) vs. The Defendant	ADDITIONAL JUDGE	20-04-2024	Submitted

Serial No.3 of the above scanned image is of importance and Serial No.3 shows that written statement has been duly e-filed on 23.04.2024. We also find that there is no dispute or contestation that the plaintiff has been favoured with an advance copy of the written statement. The order of the Commercial Division being order dated 26.04.2024 reads as follows:

'C.S.(COMM.DIV.) No.1 of 2024

P.VELMURUGAN. J.

As directed by this Court on 05.04.2024, the defendant has not filed the written statement. Therefore, the defendant is set exparte.

2. The plaintiff is directed to file proof affidavit



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

for chief examination and appear before the learned Master on 29.04.2024, for recording proof affidavit and marking of documents.

3. List the matter on 30.04.2024 "for Judgment".

26.04.2024

Ksa-2

Note: Issue order copy on 26.04.2024'

Learned counsel for defendant MIPL submits that proviso to Section 13(1A) of CCA dissuaded the defendant from assailing the afore-referred order. We make it clear that the scope of proviso to Section 13(1A) is being examined by this Court in another set of matters but nonetheless we are inclined to accept the argument that the defendant waited for the *ex parte* judgment to be made and the defendant has assailed the same raising all the points available lock, stock and barrel. As regards e-filing of the written statement as e-filing facility is available, the aforementioned website clearly shows that written statement has been filed on 23.04.2024 and as there is no disputation that the same has been taken on file and the plaintiff has been favoured with a copy of the same, we have



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

WEB COPY

no hesitation in saying that written statement has been duly filed on 23.04.2024 and in such similar matters where e-filing is resorted to, the reckoning date will be computed in this manner.

(iii) Before proceeding further, as regards the official website, we remind ourselves that this Court has held that filing of certified copies of fair and decreetal orders and/or certified copies of judgment and decree are not imperative vide order dated 01.08.2024 in C.M.P.No.14960 of 2024 in C.M.A.SR.No.86395 of 2024 and the order reads as follows:

`C.M.P.No.14960 of 2024
in
C.M.A.SR.No.86395 of 2024

M.SUNDAR, J.

and

K.GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI, J.

(Order of the court was made by M.SUNDAR, J.)

Captioned 'Civil Miscellaneous Petition' [hereinafter 'CMP' for the sake of convenience] has been filed with a simple and innocuous prayer to dispense with production of certified copy of an order dated 03.01.2024 made in Commercial Original Suit No.7 of 2023 [previously O.S. No.11/2010 of II Additional District Judge, Salem (CNR No.TNSA 23-000054-2023)] on the file of the Commercial



Court (District Judge cadre), Salem. This '03.01.2024 order' shall be referred to as 'impugned order' and 'Commercial Court (District Judge cadre), Salem' shall be referred to as 'said Commercial Court', both for the sake of convenience and clarity.

2.Mr.M.S.Seshadri, learned counsel for petitioner, adverting to support affidavit submitted that a web copy (hard copy) of the impugned order as downloaded from the e-Court website, i.e., https://ecourts.gov.in/ecourts_home has been filed and on that basis, pleaded that aforementioned dispense with prayer may please be acceded to.

3.In the normal circumstances, a simple terse order will suffice but this Court finds that such requests i.e., CMPs with dispense with prayers saying that web copy has been filed are recurring in multiple kinds of appeals. Therefore, with the intention of putting the matter in clear perspective, so that the same will serve as guidelines in days to come, more so owing to advent and advancement of technology and ICT (Information and Communication Technology) in court proceedings, the following order is made:

(i)'The Code of Civil Procedure, 1908' ['CPC' for the sake of brevity] has a definition clause and the same is Section 2. Sub sections (2), (9) and (14) of section 2 define 'decree', 'judgment' and 'order' respectively and these three provisions



WEB COPY



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

read as follows:

'2.Definitions.-*In this Act, unless there is anything repugnant in the subject or context,-*

(1) xxxxxxxx

(2) “decree” means the formal expression of an adjudication which, so far as regards the Court expressing it, conclusively determines the rights of the parties with regard to all or any of the matters in controversy in the suit and may be either preliminary or final. It shall be deemed to include the rejection of a plaint and the determination of any question within section 144, but shall not include--

(a) any adjudication from which an appeal lies as an appeal from an order, or

(b) any order of dismissal for default.

Explanation.--A decree is preliminary when further proceedings have to be taken before the suit can be completely disposed of. It is final when such adjudication completely disposes of the suit. It may be partly preliminary and partly final;

(3) to (8) xxxxxxxx

(9) “Judgment” means the statement given by the Judge on the grounds of a decree or order;

(10) to (13) xxxxxxxx

(14) “order” means the formal expression of any decision of a Civil Court which is not a decree;'

(ii) As regards appeals to this Court, four Orders under First Schedule to CPC are of relevance and they are Orders XLI, XLI-A, XLI-B and XLIII of CPC.

(iii) In Order XLI captioned 'Appeals from Original Decrees', there is a Madras amendment to Rule (1) thereat. This order provides for appeals against judgments and decrees. The Madras amendment makes filing of certified copy of decree imperative and provides for certified copy of judgment being dispensed with by the appellate court.

(iv) Order XLI-A provides for 'Appeals to the High Court from Original Decrees of Subordinate Courts'. In Order XLI-A also, there is a Madras insert and as regards Rules (1) to (3), Madras insert adopts



WEB COPY



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

Kerala which says that one certified copy of judgment is imperative and there is no dispense with provision.

(v) Order XLI-B captioned 'Letters Patent Appeals' ('LPA' for the sake of brevity) also has a Madras amendment and the proviso to Rule (1) thereat makes it clear that it shall not be necessary to file copies of the judgment and decree appealed from. To be noted, Order XLI-B provides for intra-court appeals.

(vi) Order XLIII captioned 'Appeals From Orders' gives an adumbration of orders qua Section 104 CPC which are appealable. These adumbrations are (a) to (w) but making provision for additions and deletions, there are 18 kinds of orders.

(vii) All aforementioned insertions were made prior to advent (much less advancement) of ICT providing for web copies. Before we proceed further, it is deemed appropriate to write that as regards Madras High Court judgments, decrees and / or orders uploaded in the official website, they are both water marked and QR Coded. To be noted, QR Code necessarily means that one can go to the website and cross check the authenticity of the web copy as unlike the bar code which gives certain particulars, the QR Code takes you to website directly.

(viii) Reverting to dispense with prayer as regards appeals from Original Decrees, one has to necessarily understand the same as appeals to appellate courts other than the High Court as Order XLI-A provides for appeals to High Court from original decrees of subordinate Courts. As already alluded to supra, as regards Order XLI, appeals to appellate courts other than High Court, there is a provision for dispensing with certified copy of the judgment but certified copy of the decree is imperative, number of copies are set out there in Rule (1) but considering the scope of the matter at hand, it is not necessary to go into the same.

(ix) As regards appeals to this Court, i.e., High Court from original decrees of Subordinate Courts, there is no provision for dispensing with



WEB COPY



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

printed copies of judgments. As regards intra court appeals under Order XLI-B, as already alluded to supra, the proviso to rule (1) [as in Madras and Pondicherry] makes it clear that it is not necessary to file copies of judgment and decree appealed from.

(x) Order XLIII is a mere adumbration of 18 kinds of orders which are appealable and there is allusion to this supra in this order.

(xi) For the present, we are putting aside Order XLI as that deals with appeals from original decrees to the appellate court other than High Court.

(xii) As regards Order XLI-A, we are of the view that if it is not necessary to file copies of judgment and decree in intra court appeal under Order XLI-B, there is no reason as to why it should be imperative for Order XLI-A, as the only conceivable reason has paled into insignificance owing to availability of web copies which are authenticated by water marked and QR Coded. To be noted, the only conceivable reason is, in a intra court appeal, records were and are available in the same court and authenticity can be readily ascertained or the case file can be looked into, whereas in appeals under Order XLI-A, records will have to be summoned from the court which made original decree but this territorial barrier has now been eliminated owing to ICT advancement as an order/decreed/judgment made by any court anywhere in Tamil Nadu which is uploaded in the official web site is readily available. Therefore, with regard to Order XLI-A appeals, we direct the Registry to place this file before Hon'ble Acting Chief Justice for referring the matter to Hon'ble Rule Committee for considering an appropriate amendment to Rules. In the interregnum, dispense with petitions shall be filed and the same shall be considered on case to case basis.

(xiii) As regards Order XLI-B intra court appeals, we make it clear that Registry shall not insist on certified copies of impugned judgments and/or decrees, i.e., judgments and / or decrees appealed from in the light of Madras amendment to proviso to



WEB COPY



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

Rule (1).

*(xiv)As a extension of previous point, we deem it appropriate to add that intra court appeals under Section 37 of 'The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (Act 26 of 1996)' [hereinafter 'A and C' Act for the sake of convenience] are not LPAs and Clause 15 will not apply in the light of **Fuerst Day Lawson** principle, namely **Fuerst Day Lawson Ltd. Vs. Jindal Exports Ltd.**, reported in **(2011) 8 SCC 333**. However, a set of rules have been made by Madras High Court by exercise of powers under Section 82 of A and C Act. We deem it appropriate to write that in a statutory appeal under Section 37 of A and C Act, which will not qualify as an appeal under Clause 15 of Letters Patent also, Registry shall not insist on certified copy of judgment and/or decree appealed from as long as hard copies of web copies which are downloaded from the official website of Madras High Court (watermarked and QR Coded) are produced. Hon'ble Rule Committee shall consider suitable amendments to Rules of this Court made inter-alia under Section 82 of A and C Act too.*

(xv)As regards Order XLIII, as already alluded to supra, it is only an adumbration of 18 kinds of orders which are appealable and it will suffice to say that if orders appealed against fall under intra court category under Order XLI-B, Registry shall not insist on certified copies of judgment / order as long as hard copies of web copies which are downloaded from the official website of Madras High Court (watermarked and QR Coded) are produced but if the orders appealed against fall under XLI-A category, a dispense with petition shall be filed for the present (until Hon'ble Rule Committee takes a decision subject to reference to Hon'ble Rule Committee at the discretion of Hon'ble Acting Chief Justice) and the same shall be decided on case to case basis.

(xvi)To be noted, in cases of this nature, limitation will be computed from the date of the order but where certified copies are filed, the obtaining



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

computation now in vogue shall continue.

4.Reverting to the case on hand, it is an appeal against an order which fall under Clause (a) of Rule (1) of Order XLIII, as it is a order returning a plaint under Order VII Rule 10 CPC but this order has been made by said Commercial Court, it qualifies as Subordinate Court within the meaning of Order XLI-A and therefore, in this case, we accept the web copy and accede to the dispense with prayer.

5.Before we conclude, we make it clear that ideally we would prefer to use the nomenclature 'District Court' and not 'Subordinate Court' but considering the language in which the Order is couched, we have reproduced the same.

6.Captioned CMP is ordered as prayed for.
There shall be no order as to costs.

(M.S., J.) (K.G.T.,J.)
01.08.2024

vvk

P.S. I : Registry is directed to place this order before Hon'ble Acting Chief Justice and seek suitable orders inter-alia regarding reference to Hon'ble Rule Committee.

P.S.II : Upload forthwith.



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

P.S.III : All concerned including the Registry of Madras High Court to act forthwith on the uploaded soft copy of this proceedings as uploaded in the official website of this Court. To be noted, the soft copies uploaded in the official website of this Court are water marked, besides being QR Coded.'

iv) Reverting to the point, the sequitur of aforementioned undisputed facts is impugned *ex parte* judgment deserves to be dislodged as the same has been made disregarding the written statement filed by sole defendant (MIPL)

13. The discussion and dispositive reasoning leads to the inevitable conclusion that impugned judgment and decree is set aside and the matter will now go back to Hon'ble Commercial Division for trial on merits. This means that the matter will be listed within a fortnight from the date on which this order is uploaded in the official website i.e., listed before Commercial Division for Case Management Hearing, admission and denial of documents and other proceedings as per amended CPC (as amended by CCA). Though obvious, we make it clear that the clock will start ticking and calendar will start moving as regards time line qua CPC as amended by CCA (Section 16 read with Schedule thereat), when the



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

matter is next listed before Commercial Division post / pursuant to this order.

14. Be that as it may, both the learned counsel before us submit that the parties will also explore the possibility of settlement by resorting to mediation. It is open to the parties to make this request before Hon'ble Commercial Division and obviously Commercial Division will consider the same on its own merits and in accordance with law.

15. Ergo, the sequitur is captioned OSA is allowed albeit with the aforementioned observations and directions. As a consequence, captioned CMP thereat is disposed of as closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(M.S.J.) (K.G.T.J.)
21.08.2024

Index: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes

gpa

P.S. I: Upload forthwith

P.S.II : All concerned including the Registry of Madras High Court to act forthwith on the uploaded soft copy of this proceedings as uploaded in the official website of this Court. To be noted, the soft copies uploaded in the official website of this Court are water marked, besides being QR Coded.

P.S.III: Registry to place this order before Hon'ble Acting Chief Justice and seek suitable orders inter alia regarding directions to Registry.



WEB COPY



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024



WEB COPY



O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024

**M.SUNDAR.J.,
and
K.GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI, J.,
gpa**

**O.S.A (CAD) No.90 of 2024
&
C.M.P.No.16667 of 2024**

21.08.2024