



\$~1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CS(COMM) 556/2016**

M/S VALECHA ENGINEERING LTD

..... Plaintiff

Through: None.

versus

THE GOVT OF NCTD & ORS.

..... Defendants

Through: Mr. Rishikesh Kuamr, ASC, GNCTD,
Ms. Sheenu Priya, Mr. Atik Gill, Mr.
Sudhir Kumar Shukla & Mr. Sudhir,
Advocates for GNCTD.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

08.02.2024

%

1. None appeared on behalf of the plaintiff on 24.04.2023.
2. Ms. Sangeeta Sandhi, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the plaintiff on 01.12.2022 sought her discharged as she had no instructions from the plaintiff. Accordingly, she was discharged.
3. Present none on behalf of the plaintiff today.
4. Counsel for the defendant Nos. 1 to 3 submits that the costs of Rs. 10,000/- imposed *vide* Order dated 24.10.2019 have been deposited.
5. On perusal of the record, it is found that the proof of amount so deposited by the defendant Nos. 1 to 3 has not been placed on record.
6. On query, counsel for the defendant Nos. 1 to 3 submits that she has the hard copy of the proof of deposit of costs of Rs. 10,000/- and further submits that she can place the same on record today itself.



7. It is unfortunate to observe that in the Order dated 14.09.2023, it was submitted on behalf of the defendant Nos. 1 to 3, the costs of Rs. 10,000/- had been deposited after 01.12.2022, though the proof of the same had not been placed on record.
8. Counsel for the defendant Nos. 1 to 3 seeks one week's time to place the same on record.
9. It may be noted that after more than one year, the cop of the aforesaid deposit has not yet been placed on record, but the hard copy of the same is with counsel for the defendant Nos. 1 to 3, who submits that if the Court desires, she can hand over the hard copy of the deposit in the Court today itself.
10. The Court refrains itself from commenting on the lackadaisical conduct of the defendant Nos. 1 to 3 who found it difficult to even place the proof of having deposited the costs of Rs. 10,000/- after more than one year, on record.
11. Since none has been appearing on behalf of the plaintiff, the present Suit is dismissed in default and for non-prosecution.
12. No further directions are required to be issued to the defendant Nos. 1 to 3.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

FEBRUARY 8, 2024

S.Sharma