



2026:KER:39329

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE EASWARAN S.

MONDAY, THE 1ST DAY OF JUNE 2026 / 11TH JYAISHTA, 1948

OP(C) NO. 335 OF 2026

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 19.12.2025 IN IA 23/2025 IN CS NO.118
OF 2024 OF COMMERCIAL COURT, ERNAKULAM.

PETITIONER(S) /PETITIONER/2ND DEFENDANT:

CLAUDIA Z. SPRINGER
AS CHAPTER 11 TRUSTEE, NOVO ADVISERS CORPORATE HEAD
QUARTERS, 401 N, FRANKLIN STREET, SUITE 4,
EAST CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, PIN - 60654.

BY ADV.

SMT. ANITHA MATHAI MUTHIRENTHY
SRI. SAMUDRA SARANGI

RESPONDENT(S) /RESPONDENTS/PLAINTIFFS & DEFENDANTS 1 AND 3 - 7:

- 1 VOIZZIT TECHNOLOGY PRIVATE LIMITED
48/1391, 1C, PLUMFLOWER, MATHER CONSTRUCTIONS PVT LTD,
OPPOSITE GOLD SOUK, VYTTILA, ERNAKULAM, KERALA,
INDIA - 682019. THROUGH ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR
RAJENDRAN VELLAPPALATH, AGED 51 YEARS,
S/O BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, VELLAPPALATH HOUSE,
KANNIPARAMBA P.O, MAVOOR VIA, KOZHIKODE,
KERALA, PIN - 673661.
- 2 VOIZZIT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LLC
OFFICE NO. 732, BUSINESS VILLAGE, B BLOCK DEIRA,
DUBAI, UAE THROUGH ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR RAJENDRAN
VELLAPPALATH, AGED 51 YEARS, S/O. BALAKRISHNAN NAIR,
VELLAPPALATH HOUSE, KANNIPARAMBA P.O, MAVOOR VIA,
KOZHIKODE, KERALA, PIN - 673661.
- 3 THINK & LEARN PRIVATE LIMITED
IBC KNOWLEDGE PARK, 4/1, 2ND FLOOR, TOWER D
BANNERGHATTA MAIN ROAD, BANGALORE, KARNATAKA, INDIA,
THROUGH ITS RESOLUTION PROFESSIONAL SHAILENDRA AJMERA,
PIN - 560029.



2026:KER:39329

- 4 GOOGLE INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED
3RD FLOOR, PRESTIGE SIGMA, NO. 3, VITTALMALLYA ROAD,
BANGALORE, INDIA, REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING
DIRECTOR, PIN - 560001.
- 5 AMAZON SELLER SERVICES PRIVATE LIMITED
8TH FLOOR, BRIDGE GATE WAY 26/1, BRIDGE WARD TRADE
CENTRE, DR RAJKUMAR ROAD, BANGALORE, INDIA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR, PIN - 560055.
- 6 MICROSOFT CORPORATION (INDIA) PRIVATE LIMITED
807, NEW DELHI HOUSE, NEW DELHI, INDIA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR, PIN - 110001
- 7 STRIPE INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED
(INCORRECTLY NAMED IN THE COMMERCIAL SUIT VOIZZIT
TECHNOLOGY PVT LTD V. THINK AND LEARN PVT LTD C.S.
118/2024 AS STRIPE PAYMENT INDIA PVT. LIMITED)
PRESTIGE TECH PACIFIC PARK, 11TH FLOOR,
BUILDING NO. 2, KADUBEESANAHALLI VILLAGE,
VARTHUR, HOBLI, BANGALORE EAST TALUK, PANATHUR,
BANGALORE, KARNATAKA, INDIA, PIN - 560103.

BY ADVS.

SRI.K.ANAND - R1 AND R2

SRI. CYRIAC TOM - R3

SHRI.SHINTO MATHEW ABRAHAM - R5

SRI.ARUN THOMAS

SMT.VEENA RAVEENDRAN

SMT.KARTHIKA MARIA

SRI.ANIL SEBASTIAN PULICKEL

SMT.LEAH RACHEL NINAN

SHRI.MATHEW NEVIN THOMAS

SHRI.KARTHIK RAJAGOPAL

SHRI.KURIAN ANTONY MATHEW

SMT.APARNNA S.

SHRI.ARUN JOSEPH MATHEW

SHRI.NOEL NINAN NINAN

SHRI.ADEEN NAZAR

SHRI.ROHAN MATHEW

SHRI.R.K.JAYALAKSHMI

THIS OP (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 01.06.2026, THE
COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



EASWARAN S., J.

OP(C) No. 335 of 2026

Dated this the 01st day of June, 2026

JUDGMENT

The 2nd defendant who is a Chapter 11 Trustee appointed by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware in a bankruptcy proceedings initiated against the subsidiary companies of the 1st defendant incorporated in the United States has come up with this original petition seeking to strike off C.S. No. 118 of 2024 from the files of the Commercial Court – III, Ernakulam.

2. C.S. No. 118 of 2024 instituted by the 1st respondent/plaintiff seeking the following reliefs;

i. Declaring that the plaintiff 1 and 2 have the absolute right, title and ownership over (Epic Creations INC and Tangible Play INC including but not limited to) the domains and websites `www.getepic.com` and `www.playosmo.com`.

ii. Issue a Mandatory Injunction directing the defendants 3 to 7 to restore the domain `www.getepic.com` and `www.playosmo.com` and ensure its functioning in the platforms of defendants 3 to 7, so as to benefit the plaintiffs and other stakeholders



2026:KER:39329

including the subscribers and employees of the plaintiffs.

iii. Permanent Prohibitory Injunction restraining the defendants 1 to 7 from interfering with the access of the plaintiff 1 and 2 while exercising lawful right on the domains, Apps and websites www.getepic.com and www.playosmo.com."

3. The 2nd defendant approached this Court in O.P.(C) No. 1377 of 2025 which led to judgment dated 23.07.2025 (Ext. P28) wherein the prayer to strike off the suit was rejected, however, liberty was granted to the petitioner herein to move before the jurisdictional Court for appropriate reliefs. Challenging the judgment of this Court, the petitioner herein approached the Supreme Court in SLP(C) No. 24799 of 2025 which led to Ext. P29 order.

3.1. Before the Supreme Court, it was contended by the petitioner that the subject matter of the suit filed by the respondents 1 and 2 before the Commercial Court – III, Ernakulam, is subjudice before the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, and the two Companies i.e. '*Epic Creations INC*' and '*Tangible Play INC*' qua the reliefs which have been sought for is the subject matter of the bankruptcy proceedings in the United States. According to the petitioner there were other reasons which prompted her to move the High Court directly which warranted interference in exercise



2026:KER:39329

of the powers under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. The Supreme Court by Order dated 15.09.2025 disposed of the petition for special leave permitting the petitioner to move an application under Order X Rule 2 or Order VII Rule 11 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, as the case may be, before the jurisdictional Court. In tune with the liberty granted by the Supreme Court, the petitioner filed I.A. No. 23 of 2025 seeking to strike off the suit from the file. The application was ordered by the Commercial Court – III, Ernakulam, by Order dated 19.12.2025 stating that pendency of a proceedings before the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware is not a bar to entertain a commercial suit before the jurisdictional Civil Court in India. Reliance is placed to explain Section 10 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908. Accordingly, the application was rejected and hence, the present original petition.

4. Heard Sri. Samudra Sarangi, the learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner, Sri. K. Anand, the learned Counsel appearing for the respondents 1 and 2, Sri. Cyriac Tom, the learned Counsel appearing for the 3rd respondent and Sri. Shinto Mathew Abraham, the learned Counsel for the 5th respondent.

5. Though multifarious arguments were advanced touching upon the sustainability of the claim before the Commercial Court – III, Ernakulam, as regards the declaratory reliefs sought for by the respondents



2026:KER:39329

1 and 2, the plaintiffs and also the consequential mandatory and prohibitory injunction, the record of these proceedings indicate that the subject matter over which the declaratory relief is sought for stands already resolved by orders of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware on 20.05.2025 and that the subsequent purchasers have assumed operations of the Companies in question. The proceedings before the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware also indicate that respondents 1 and 2, the plaintiffs, had actively participated in the proceedings.

6. In order to test the sustainability of the order impugned, this court must decide two questions; (i) *Whether the plaintiffs should be permitted to proceed with C.S. No. 118 of 2024 as against the petitioner/2nd defendant, especially in the light of the proceedings before the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware?* and (ii) *Since the 1st defendant is already under insolvency proceedings before the National Company Law Tribunal, Bengaluru, in CP (IB) No. 149/BB/2023 and that an order appointing an Corporate Insolvency Resolution Professional is passed on 16.07.2024, whether the present suit can be proceeded by the plaintiffs?*

7. The learned Counsel for the petitioner appearing for the Chapter 11 Trustee appointed by the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware points out that, at any rate, the 2nd defendant cannot be



2026:KER:39329

proceeded with in the present proceedings inasmuch as she is only an Officer of the Court and had undertaken and completed the process of sale of the subsidiary companies of the 1st defendant incorporated in the United States. The learned Counsel for the petitioner further points out that permitting the petitioner to proceed with the suit would be an abuse of process of law especially since the plaintiffs have already participated before the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware. It is further pointed out that there is a clear suppression of the facts as regards the participation of the plaintiffs before the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware in the present suit. In fact, for prosecuting the present suit, the respondents 1 and 2, the plaintiffs are already facing contempt proceedings before the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware.

8. It is undeniable that, the plaintiffs in this case, participated in the proceedings before the United States Bankruptcy Court for District of Delaware. It is also indisputable that the subject matter of the declaratory relief sought for by the plaintiffs in the present suit is no longer available since the same has been sold by orders of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware on 20.05.2025. That be so, it will be a farcical exercise, if the Commercial Court – III, Ernakulam, is allowed to proceed with the suit in order to find whether the respondents 1 and 2 are entitled for a declaratory relief especially since the subject matter of the suit itself has



2026:KER:39329

got eroded by operation of the orders passed by a Court of competent jurisdiction outside the territory of India. That be so, this Court finds considerable force in the submissions of the learned Counsel for the petitioner that by permitting respondents 1 and 2 to proceed with the present suit would only be an abuse of the process of law.

9. The Court below however held that going by explanation to Section 10 CPC, the present suit is not barred merely because of pendency of a suit in the foreign Court. This Court fails to comprehend how Section 10 is attracted in this case. The relief sought for by the petitioner is not to stay the suit but to strike out the suit from the files of the court for suppression of material facts. It is precisely for this reason, power under Section 151 was invoked.

10. It must be remembered that the petitioner had approached the Trial Court with the present application armed with the liberty granted by the Supreme Court. That being so, the Trial Court was obliged to see whether the 2nd defendant is a necessary party to the suit and whether any relief is claimed against her.

11. A reading of the relief sought for in the suit will show that the plaintiffs have not sought for any relief against the 2nd defendant. The consequential mandatory injunction sought for against the 2nd defendant is largely dependent on the plaintiff establishing its rights over the domain



2026:KER:39329

registered in the United States. It is borne out from the records that the plaintiffs have already participated in the proceedings before the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware and had suffered various orders which are suppressed.

12. As regards the first contention, this Court must see whether the present suit can be rejected for suppression of facts or is vexatious or does it disclose any cause of action. In ***Manjula and others v. D. A. Srinivas [2026 SCC online 831]*** observed as follows;

"Any suppression of a material fact, which has the effect of creating an illusory cause of action and eclipsing the legal bar, ought to be dealt with firmly, and the plaintiff would be liable to be summarily rejected. It is also settled law that a person who has suppressed a material fact is not entitled to any relief. Suppression of a material fact within the knowledge of the party amounts to fraud upon the Court. The relevancy or otherwise of a fact is to be decided by the Court, and parties cannot contend that they omitted a material fact on the assumption that it was not relevant. It is not only the duty of the Court to summarily reject the claim of a party suppressing a material fact, but also to ensure that any benefit obtained by such party is undone and status quo ante restored in its fairness and equity."



2026:KER:39329

13. The averments in the plaint, however, does state about the pendency of the proceedings before the US Courts. Going by the transcript of proceedings dated 12-11-2024(Ext P 7) in In Re Chapter 11, Case No 24-11161(JTD) before the United States Bankruptcy Court of District of Delaware, it is evident that the plaintiffs had participated in the proceedings. Therefore, it is evident that there is a clear suppression of material facts.

14. Another aspect which this Court must take note is that, the declaratory reliefs sought for in the suit is basically against the subsidiary company of the 1st defendant registered in the United States. The registration of the said companies under US Laws is not disputed before this Court. Surprisingly, the companies against whom the declaratory reliefs are sought for are not made a party to the suit. Instead, the plaintiff has sought consequential mandatory injunction against defendants 3 to 7 to restore the domain of those companies functioning in the platform. Still further, defendants 3 to 7 are also outside the Jurisdiction of Commercial Court Ernakulam. Read as a whole, this Court is satisfied that the plaint in CS No 118 of 2024 is nothing but a clever piece of drafting, a camouflage to make it appear that the cause of action arises within the territorial jurisdiction of the Commercial Court Kochi. Therefore, this court is inclined to hold that the plaint in CS No 118/2024 fails to disclose any cause of action against the 2nd defendant and is filed suppressing material facts.



2026:KER:39329

15. Alternatively, it is contended that the suit itself is not maintainable since it is barred under Order 7 Rule 11(d) of the CPC, since the 1st defendant is already under insolvency proceedings before the NCLT Bengaluru. However, this court finds that the petitioner has not raised this contention in her application before the Subordinate Court and the same is raised for the first time before this Court.

16. Further question is whether this Court should consider the said issue in this original petition. The suit is seen filed on 20-11-2024, whereas Ext. P4 Order reveals that the National Company Law Tribunal, Bengaluru Bench passed Orders on CP (IB) No. 149/BB/2023 on 16.07.2024 appointing Corporate Insolvency Resolution Professional at the instance of the Board of Control for Cricket in India which is a creditor in respect of 1st respondent company. Ext. P4 order reveals that the 1st defendant Corporate debtor has been put on moratorium in terms of Section 14 of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016 thus attracting the bar under Section 14(1) (a) of the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016.

17. However, on closer scrutiny of the records it is seen that the 1st defendant is set ex-parte and is seen represented by the Managing Director and not the resolution professional. Since the issue pertaining to the maintainability of the suit in view of the initiation proceedings under Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016, was not raised by any of the parties,



2026:KER:39329

this Court feels that it is only appropriate to reserve liberty to the resolution professional to move an appropriate application under Order 7 rule 11 raising all possible contentions.

18. Accordingly, this original petition is hereby allowed in part by setting aside Ext. P2 order. Consequently, I.A. No. 23 of 2025 stands allowed and petitioner/2nd defendant in C.S. No. 118 of 2024 is ordered to be struck off from the party array. The Commercial Court -III Ernakulam is directed to carry out the directions of this court forthwith. The resolution professional appointed by NCLT Bengaluru is at liberty to move appropriate application before the court below under Order 7 Rule 11 of the CPC.

**Sd/-
EASWARAN S.
JUDGE**

Svn



2026:KER:39329

APPENDIX OF OP(C) NO. 335 OF 2026

PETITIONER EXHIBITS

- EXHIBIT P1 A COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 7 OCTOBER 2024 OF THE DELAWARE BANKRUPTCY COURT APPROVING THE APPOINTMENT OF THE PETITIONER AS THE CHAPTER 11 TRUSTEE FOR EACH OF THE US DEBTOR COMPANIES AND THE NOTICE OF APPOINTMENT OF THE PETITIONER
- EXHIBIT P2 A COPY OF THE ORDER 19 DECEMBER 2025 PASSED BY THE LD. COMMERCIAL COURT-III, ERNAKULAM DISMISSING THE I.A. NO. 23 OF 2025 FILED BY THE PETITIONER SEEKING DISMISSAL OF THE COMMERCIAL SUIT BEARING NUMBER CS NO. 118 OF 2024
- EXHIBIT P3 A COPY OF THE AUTOMATIC STAY ORDER DATED 28 JUNE 2024 PASSED BY THE DELAWARE BANKRUPTCY COURT
- EXHIBIT P4 OF THE ORDER DATED 16 JULY 2024 OF THE NATIONAL COMPANY LAW TRIBUNAL, BENGALURU ADMITTING THINK & LEARN IN INSOLVENCY
- EXHIBIT P5 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 24 FEBRUARY 2025 APPROVING APPOINTMENT OF MR SHAILENDRA AJMERA AS THE RESOLUTION PROFESSIONAL OF THINK & LEARN
- EXHIBIT P6 A COPY OF THE CLEAR AND UNEQUIVOCAL ORDERS PASSED BY THE DELAWARE BANKRUPTCY COURT AGAINST THE ILLEGAL AND MALAFIDE ACTIONS UNDERTAKEN BY RESPONDENT NOS. 1 AND 2
- EXHIBIT P7 A COPY OF THE ENTIRE TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING HELD BEFORE THE DELAWARE BANKRUPTCY COURT ON 12 NOVEMBER 2024
- EXHIBIT P8 TRUE COPY OF THE AGREEMENT DATED 4 SEPTEMBER 2023 BETWEEN RIJU RAVEENDRAN AND THINK & LEARN (THINK & LEARN LOAN AGREEMENT)



2026:KER:39329

- EXHIBIT P9 TRUE COPY OF THE ASSIGNMENT DEED DATED 1 DECEMBER 2023 BETWEEN RIJU RAVEENDRAN AND VOIZZIT UAE (VOIZZIT ASSIGNMENT AGREEMENT)
- EXHIBIT P10 A COPY OF THE NOTICE DATED 1 APRIL 2024 ISSUED ON THE LETTERHEAD OF VOIZZIT UAE TO THINK & LEARN (VOIZZIT NOTICE)
- EXHIBIT P11 A COPY OF THE DOCUMENTS INCLUDING THE ENTIRE PLAINT AND THE ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS IN RELATION TO THE COMMERCIAL SUIT BEFORE THE LD. COMMERCIAL COURT AT ERNAKULAM
- EXHIBIT P12 A TRUE TYPED AND TRANSLATED COPY OF THE ALLEGED CERTIFICATE OF OWNERSHIP DECLARED BY DUBAI COURTS FILED AS DOCUMENT NO. 3 WITH THE COMMERCIAL SUIT
- EXHIBIT P13 A TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARA COPY OF THE DECLARATION DATED 16 NOVEMBER 2024 MADE BY RESPONDENT NO. 3 BEFORE THE DELAWARE BANKRUPTCY COURT
- EXHIBIT P14 A TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING HELD BEFORE THE DELAWARE BANKRUPTCY COURT ON 3 DECEMBER 2024
- EXHIBIT P15 A COPY OF THE VOIZZIT COMPLAINT DATED 10 DECEMBER 2024 FILED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE DELAWARE BANKRUPTCY COURT
- EXHIBIT P16 A COPY OF THE VOIZZIT TRO DATED 11 DECEMBER 2024 PASSED BY THE DELAWARE BANKRUPTCY COURT
- EXHIBIT P17 A COPY OF THE VOIZZIT INJUNCTION DATED 18 DECEMBER 2024
- EXHIBIT P18 A COPY OF THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE HEARING HELD ON 29



2026:KER:39329

JANUARY 2025

- EXHIBIT P19 A COPY OF THE CONTEMPT ORDER DATED 30 JANUARY 2025

- EXHIBIT P20 A COPY OF THE EMAIL DATED 13 FEBRUARY 2025 ADDRESSED BY PETITIONER'S COUNSEL TO COUNSEL OF RESPONDENT NOS. 1 AND 2

- EXHIBIT P21 A COPY OF THE JUDGEMENT ORDER DATED 19 FEBRUARY 2025 PASSED BY THE DELAWARE BANKRUPTCY COURT

- EXHIBIT P22 A COPY OF THE APPLE JUDGMENT ORDER DATED 4 JUNE 2025 PASSED BY THE DELAWARE BANKRUPTCY COURT

- EXHIBIT P23 A COPY OF THE EMAIL DATED 21 MAY 2025 FROM THE COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENT NOS. 2 AND 3 IN INDIA INFORMING THE PETITIONER OF THE IMPUGNED ORDER

- EXHIBIT P24 A COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 21 MAY 2025 ADDRESSED TO THE PETITIONER BY THE COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENT NOS. 1 AND 2 IN INDIA

- EXHIBIT P25 A COPY OF THE HIGH COURT STAY ORDER PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT DATED 21 MAY 2025 IN A PETITION FILED BY RESPONDENT NO. 1 AND 2 IN O.P. (C) NO. 1187 OF 2025, TITLED, 'VOIZZIT TECHNOLOGY PVT LTD V. THINK AND LEARN PVT LTD'

- EXHIBIT P26 A COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 27 MAY 2025 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT IN SLP (C) NO. 015598 OF 2025, TITLED, 'CLAUDIA Z SPRINGER V. VOIZZIT TECHNOLOGY PRIVATE LIMITED'

- EXHIBIT P27 A COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 17 OCTOBER 2025 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT IN OP(C) NO. 2017 OF 2025 TITLED 'VOIZZIT TECHNOLOGY PRIVATE LIMITED AND ANR. V. THINK & LEARN AND ORS',



2026:KER:39329

- EXHIBIT P28 A COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 23 JULY 2025 IN THE DISMISSAL PETITION IE O.P. (C) NO. 1377 OF 2025, TITLED, 'CLAUDIA Z SPRINGER V. VOIZZIT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LTD' BEFORE THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF KERALA BEFORE THIS HON'BLE COURT
- EXHIBIT P29 A COPY OF THE EXPEDITIOUS DISPOSAL ORDER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 2025 PASSED BY THE APEX COURT IN THE SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION TITLED 'CLAUDIA Z SPRINGER V. VOIZZIT TECHNOLOGY PRIVATE LIMITED AND ORS' BEARING SLP (C) NO. 24799 OF 2025 PREFERRED BY THE PETITIONER
- EXHIBIT P30 TRUE COPY OF THE ORDERS OF THIS HON'BLE HIGH COURT IN CON. CASE (C) 1201 OF 2025, DATED 21 NOVEMBER 2025
- EXHIBIT P31 A COPY OF THE OF THE ORDERS OF THIS HON'BLE HIGH COURT IN CON. CASE (C) 1201 OF 2025, DATED 27 NOVEMBER 2025
- EXHIBIT P32 A COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT IN SLP (C) NOS. 35060-35061/2025 TITLED 'SUNIL THOMAS AUTHORISED REPRESENTATIVE OF GLAS TRUST COMPANY LLC V. VOIZZIT TECHNOLOGY PRIVATE LIMITED AND ORS' DATED 27 NOVEMBER 2025, STAYING THE OPERATION OF THE ORDERS OF THIS HON'BLE COURT DATED 21 NOVEMBER 2025 AND 27 NOVEMBER 2025
- EXHIBIT P33 A COPY OF THE DISMISSAL APPLICATION IE I.A. NO. 23 OF 2025 FILED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE LD. COMMERCIAL COURT IN C.S. 118 OF 2024 SEEKING DISMISSAL OF THE COMMERCIAL SUIT
- EXHIBIT P34 A COPY OF THE REPLY FILED BY RESPONDENT NOS. 1 AND 2 TO THE DISMISSAL APPLICATION IE I.A. NO. 23 OF 2025 IN C.S. 118 OF 2024 BEFORE THE LD. COMMERCIAL COURT



2026:KER:39329

- EXHIBIT P35 A COPY OF THE ORDER OF THE LD. COMMERCIAL COURT DATED 4 DECEMBER 2025 DISMISSING THE FORFEITURE APPLICATION IE I.A. NO. 25 OF 2025 IN C.S. 118 OF 2024 BEFORE THE LD. COMMERCIAL COURT
- EXHIBIT P36 A COPY OF THE COMMERCIAL SUIT STAY ORDER OF THIS HON'BLE COURT DATED 11 DECEMBER 2025 IN OP(C) NO. 3223 OF 2025 TITLED 'VOIZZIT TECHNOLOGY PVT LTD V. THINK AND LEARN PVT LTD' STAYING THE OPERATION OF THE COMMERCIAL SUIT
- EXHIBIT P37 A COPY OF THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT'S ORDER DATED 18 DECEMBER 2025 IN 'CLAUDIA Z SPRINGER VS VOIZZIT TECHNOLOGY PRIVATE LIMITED & ORS. SLP (C) NO. 36873/2025' STAYING THE OPERATION OF THE COMMERCIAL SUIT STAY ORDER SUIT