



\$~7

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

FAO (COMM) 260/2023 & CM APPL. 66521/2023

**AMBIENCE DEVELOPERS AND
INFRASTRUCTURE PVT LTD**

..... Appellant

Through: Mr P.K. Agrawal and Mr Akshay Chitkara,
Advs.

versus

JUBILANT FOODWORKS LTD

..... Respondent

Through: Mr Mayank Mehandru, Ms Charu Tandon,
Mr Raghav Tandon, Mr Sarthak Kapoor and
Mr Nikhil Kharaliya, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

%

29.01.2024

[Physical Hearing/Hybrid Hearing (as per request)]

1. On the previous date, i.e., 16.01.2024, we had put certain suggestions to the parties, with the direction to return with instructions. For convenience, the relevant parts of the said order are extracted hereafter:

“1. Counsel for the parties submit that they will return with instructions as to whether it would be possible to settle the matter, by sharing the security deposit which has been withheld by the appellant. The ratio in which the security deposit could possibly be shared will be indicated to the Court on the next date of hearing.

2. We may note that the amount of security deposit available with the appellant is Rs. 15,76,006/-.

3. At the request of counsel for the parties, list on 29.01.2024.”



2. Mr Mayank Mehandru, learned counsel, who appears on behalf of the respondent, says that he has instructions to withdraw the pending suit action, i.e., CS (COMM)No.371/2022 which, according to him, concerns the amount of security deposit, referred to hereinabove.

2.1 The statement of Mr Mehandru is taken on record.

3. Given this position, Mr P.K. Agrawal, learned counsel, who appears on behalf of the appellant, says that the appeal can be closed.

3.1 It is ordered accordingly.

4. Consequently, the pending application shall also stand closed.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

AMIT BANSAL, J

JANUARY 29, 2024

aj

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)