



2025:DHC:7302



\$~104

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

% *Date of Decision: 22nd, August, 2025*

+ CM(M) 1588/2025 & CM APPL. 52236/2025

AJAY SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Keshav Kumar Verma with Mr.
Kunal Verma, Advocates.

versus

SPACEBIZ SOLUTIONS PRIVATE LIMITED & ORS.

.....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN****J U D G M E N T (oral)**

1. Petitioner is plaintiff before the learned Trial Court and is aggrieved by order dated 21.07.2025 whereby the learned Trial Court has permitted substitution of the name of the authorized representative of the defendant company.
2. The defendant Company had come up with the request that their earlier representative had resigned on account of personal reasons and, therefore, one Mr. Alok Kaushik has been appointed authorized representative. It was also apprised that he was fully aware of the facts of the case and it was in the abovesaid backdrop that he was permitted to represent the company and his name was, accordingly, substituted as authorized representative Company.
3. Such order is under challenge.
4. According to learned counsel for petitioner/plaintiff, it looks quite obvious that when the written statement was earlier filed, it was filed through one Mr. Rinku Anand, who was never validly authorized and, therefore, the written statement, as such, has no evidentiary value in the eyes of law.



2025:DHC:7302



5. Fact, however, remains that while permitting such substitution, learned Trial Court has left the abovesaid aspect open while observing that whether the earlier authorized representative had been validly appointed or not would be subject matter of trial which can always be gone into during the trial.
6. Viewed thus, this Court does not find requirement of interfering with the impugned order.
7. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed.
8. Pending application also stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

AUGUST 22, 2025/sw/JS