

November 19, 2025

To National Stock Exchange of India Ltd Listing Compliance Department Exchange Plaza, 5th Floor, C. 1, Block G, Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (E), Mumbai 400051 NSE SYMBOL: GLOBECIVIL	To BSE Limited Listing Compliance Department 1st Floor, Phiroze Jeejeebhoy Towers, Dalai Street Mumbai — 400001 SCRIP CODE: 544424
---	--

Subject: Intimation under Regulation 30 of SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Pursuant to Regulation 30 read with Schedule III of the SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015, we wish to inform you that the Hon'ble Court of Sh. Munish Bansal, District Judge-03, South District, Saket Courts Complex, New Delhi, has pronounced judgment on November 15, 2025, in the matter of CS DJ No. 8701/2016: P.D. Verma (Through LRs) vs M/s Globe Civil Projects Pvt. Ltd.(Now M/s Globe Civil Projects Ltd)

The Hon'ble Court has dismissed the suit filed by the plaintiff seeking recovery of ₹23,81,098/- (including interest) against the Company. The judgment confirms that the Company has made full and final payment for the work executed and is not liable for any further dues. The suit was found to be without cause of action and was dismissed accordingly.

This favourable judgment conclusively resolves the litigation and affirms the Company's position. A copy of the judgment is enclosed herewith for your reference.

This disclosure is being made in compliance with the applicable provisions of the Listing Regulations and for the information of stakeholders.

Thanking you,

Vineet Rattan
Digitally signed
by Vineet Rattan
Date: 2025.11.19
15:24:34 +05'30'

Vineet Rattan

Company Secretary and Compliance Officer

Membership Number: F 11724

DLST010034482016



**In the Court of Sh. Munish Bansal,
District Judge-03, South District,
Saket Courts Complex, New Delhi.**

CS DJ No. : 8701/2016

**Sh. P.D. Verma (Since deceased),
Through LRs**

**(a) Smt. Champa Devi,
W/o Late P.D. Verma**

**(b) Smt. Binesh,
W/o Late Shri Raj Kumar**

**(c) Ms. Nimmi,
D/o Late Shri Raj Kumar**

**(d) Sh. Manish Kumar,
S/o Late Shri Raj Kumar**

**(e) Sh. Ashish
S/o Late Shri Raj Kumar**

All R/o 8/150-151, Dakshinpuri Extension,
New Delhi- 110062.

.... Plaintiff

Versus

M/s Globe Civil Projects Pvt. Ltd.,
B-28, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar,
New Delhi-110017.

.... Defendant

Suit presented on : 30.09.2011

Arguments Concluded on : 30.10.2025

Judgment Pronounced on : 15.11.2025

SUIT FOR RECOVERY OF Rs.23,81,098/-
ALONGWITH INTEREST

JUDGMENT

PLAINTIFF'S CASE

1. The plaintiff has filed the present suit seeking recovery of Rs.23,81,098/- (Rupees Twenty Three Lakhs Eighty One Thousand Ninety Eight only) against the defendant.

2. Facts as averred in the plaint are that plaintiff is a petty contractor/ plumber engaged in works of sanitary installations, laying water supply fittings, sewerage system/ fittings together with other incidental works. The plaintiff was assigned jobs by the defendant of internal and external water supply, sanitary installations, underground water pipe line, sewerage drains, rain water harvesting, sewerage system external alongwith fancy fittings at its site situated at Indian Institute of Management, Lucknow, Noida, B-1, Sector 62,

Noida-201307, Uttar Pradesh. For assignment of said contract, the plaintiff submitted a rate list/ quotation and the said contract was awarded in favour of the plaintiff upon receipt of quotation dated 02.02.2006 by officials of the defendant. Upon that, the plaintiff performed the said jobs to entire satisfaction of the engineers and supervisors of the defendant besides the satisfaction of Indian Institute of Management. The plaintiff carried out the entire sanitation/ plumbing job to the best of his abilities through the workers deployed by him. Besides the jobs stated to be carried out, the plaintiff was also made to carry out some additional jobs by the officials of defendant under the assurance that his payments would be cleared at the time of final bill.

2.1 It is further averred that during the course of commencement of job, the officials of defendant used to release part payments against vouchers and finally, the entire job was completed on 30.11.2008. Subsequently, as desired by the officials of defendant, the plaintiff raised a final bill dated 20.10.2010 for a total amount of Rs.26,73,830/- and after deducting the payments already received by the plaintiff i.e. Rs.6,13,875/-, a balance amount of Rs.20,60,955/- was required to be paid by the defendant to the plaintiff.

2.2. It is further averred that it is mandatory for the contractor carrying out plumbing, sanitary and sewerage work, to carry out

ancillary jobs as per the requirements at the site besides the contractual settlements as per the desire of supervisors and engineers of the main contractor with understanding that the bills for ancillary jobs would be added in the final bill to be raised at the time of completion of job. The plaintiff also made endeavor to get the report from Noida Authorities after completion of sanitary and plumbing work being licensed plumber, under his own signatures.

2.3 It is stated that on receipt of final bill, the same was scrutinized by the defendant and its officials and based on the bill, the plaintiff received communication dated 20.11.2010 from defendant mentioning that sum of Rs.1,809/- was outstanding against the plaintiff on account of excess payment. Thereafter, the plaintiff served legal notice dated 17.02.2011 thereby claiming Rs.20,60,955/- together with interest, upon the defendant. Though the defendant did not comply with the said legal notice, however, vide its reply dated 03.03.2011, admitted and acknowledged its liability to pay the entire outstanding dues. Despite admitting, the defendant did not release the amount to the plaintiff.

2.4 On these grounds, the plaintiff is seeking recovery of Rs.23,81,098/- (Rs.20,60,955/- as principal and Rs.3,09,143/- as interest from 21.10.2010 till filing of the suit). The plaintiff is also praying for *pendente lite* and future interest @18% p.a. against the

defendant. Hence, this suit.

DEFENDANT'S CASE

3. Upon service of summons, the defendant appeared and filed written statement through its AR Sh. R.N. Jindal, who was duly authorized vide Board Resolution dated 15.02.2012, wherein it is stated that the allegations leveled through present suit are false, incorrect, baseless, absurd and misconceived; that the suit is without any cause of action; that the plaintiff has failed to complete the assigned work and also left various works which were got completed by the defendant by hiring separate work-force; that the bills raised by the plaintiff are false and incorrect as no work towards the raised bills was ever done by the plaintiff; that the defendant has already paid the plaintiff towards genuine bills for the completed assigned work.

3.1 On merits, it is stated that the rate list/ quotation dated 02.02.2006 was only handed over at the site office without any forwarding letter thereof and no such terms and conditions or any contract was ever awarded by defendant in favour of the plaintiff. The plaintiff has not completed the assigned work properly and left the work of C.P. Fittings in toilets and kitchens were not fitted properly which resulted in leakage for which the defendant has deducted Rs.15,000/- from total amount paid to plaintiff. On request,

the plaintiff employed some labourers to complete the abandoned work for which payments were made by defendant to said labourers and that the said fact is mentioned at serial no. 70 in final bill dated 20.10.2010. The bills were submitted by the plaintiff after a period of two years and that the said bill dated 20.10.2010 was exaggerated and the defendant duly clarified the same vide its reply/letter dated 20.11.2010. It is further stated that vide reply to legal notice dated 03.03.2011, the defendant made clear that they are not under any liability/ outstanding. All other averments made in the plaint are denied by the defendant and contentions made by him in the preliminary submissions, are reiterated. On these grounds, it is prayed that present suit be dismissed.

REPLICATION

4. Replication to written statement is filed on behalf of the plaintiff wherein plaintiff has reiterated and reaffirmed the pleadings made by him in the plaint and has denied the contentions of the defendant made in the written statement.

ISSUES

5. From pleadings of parties, following issues are framed vide order dated 31.10.2013:-

1. Whether the suit of plaintiff is without any cause of action?

OPD

2. *Whether the plaintiff failed to complete the assigned works on time and has left some work which was got completed by the defendant by hiring separate work force? OPD*
3. *Whether the defendant has made full and final payment against work done by the plaintiff? OPD*
4. *Whether the plaintiff carried out any additional job to the defendant company? OPP*
5. *Whether the plaintiff carried out the work of Rs.20,60,955/-? OPP*
6. *Whether the plaintiff is entitled to recover the suit amount from defendant? OPP*
7. *Relief.*

Thereafter, matter was fixed for PE.

6. During the course of trial, the plaintiff died and suit is further pursued by his legal heirs.

PLAINTIFF'S EVIDENCE

7. To prove his case, the Sh. Manish Kumar (LR no. (d) of plaintiff) stepped in witness box as PW1 and tendered his evidence by way of affidavit Ex. PW1/A, wherein he has made similar deposition as made in his plaint. PW1 has placed reliance upon certain documents:-

1. Copy of receipt of quotation dated 02.02.2006 Mark PW1/1.
2. Bills dated 16.02.08, 11.03.08, 18.03.08, 16.04.08, 10.04.08, 01.07.08, 01.09.08 and 25.10.08 Ex. PW1/2 (colly).
3. Certificate dated 15.09.2010 issued by IIML Noida Campus Ex.PW1/3.
4. Final bill dated 20.10.2010 Ex. PW1/4.
5. Letter dated 20.11.2010 Ex. PW1/5.
6. Legal notice dated 17.02.2011 Ex. PW1/6.
7. Reply to legal notice Ex. PW1/7.

PW1 was cross-examined by Ld. Counsel for the defendant.

7.1 PW2 Sh. R.S. Gautam, C.E.S. (Gr. A) Consultant (Technical), Indian Institute of Management, Lucknow (Noida Campus), deposed that Certificate Ex. PW1/3 has been issued under his signatures at point 'A' and that the same has been signed by Mr. Man Mohan Gupta, Executive Engineer, Noida Project Division at point 'B'. He stated that the contents of said certificate are true. PW2 was cross-examined by Ld. Counsel for the defendant.

Thereafter, matter was listed for DE.

DEFENDANT'S EVIDENCE

8. In defence, the defendant got examined only one witness. DW1 Sh. Vipul Khurana tendered his evidence by way of affidavit Ex. DW1/A wherein he made similar contentions as made in the written statement. He relied upon following documents:-

1. Board Resolution dated 10.01.2019 Ex. DW1/D1.
2. Duly stamped ledger book Ex. DW1/D2.
3. Work done chart Ex. DW1/D3.

DW1 was cross-examined by Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff. Thereafter, matter was listed for final arguments.

8.1 I have heard arguments addressed at length by Ld. Counsels for both the parties and carefully perused the material on record. My issue-wise findings are as under:-

ISSUE-WISE FINDINGS

Issue no. 5

Whether the plaintiff carried out the work of Rs.20,60,955/-?

OPP

9. Onus to prove issue no.1 was upon the defendant and issue no.5 was on the plaintiff.

9.1 As per plaint as well as deposition made on behalf of the plaintiff by PW-1, it is not in dispute that plaintiff was assigned by

the defendant the job of internal and external water supply sanitary installation, underground waterline, SW drains, rain water harvesting, sewerage system, external alongwith fancy fittings (hereinafter referred as plumbing works) at the site situated at Indian Institute of Management Lucknow, Noida (hereinafter referred as IIM Noida). It is also admitted on behalf of the plaintiff that the plumbing works contract was awarded in favour of the plaintiff by the defendant. Thus, there can be no dispute to the fact that privity of contract existed only between the plaintiff and the defendant and there was no privity of contract between the plaintiff and IIM Noida.

9.2 It has been submitted on behalf of the plaintiff that since IIM Noida has issued the certificate dated 15.09.2010 (Ex. PW-1/3) wherein it was mentioned that plaintiff has executed good quality of work at his complex, this proves that plaintiff has completed the plumbing work as assigned/ allotted to him through contract by the defendant. *Per contra*, counsel for the defendant has submitted that the said certificate is no conclusive proof of the completion of the plumbing works by the plaintiff. He further submits that as regards the said certificate, PW-2 in his cross-examination has clearly mentioned that the said certificate was definitely not any completion certificate and that there was no direct link of the plaintiff with IIM Noida and that the said certificate was issued in good faith on the asking of the plaintiff as plaintiff required the same for his

registration in Government Departments.

9.3 Perusal of the cross-examination of PW-2, who is one of the signatory issuing the certificate (Ex. PW-1/3), shows that PW-2 has deposed that there was no direct link of plaintiff with IIM Noida and that Mr. Manmohan Gupta Executive Engineer working under his control brought one typed certificate for his signature to which he told that defendant is not working with them directly and as such, are not supposed to issue such type of certificate. PW-2 further deposed that Mr. Manmohan Gupta told him that the certificate is required for getting defendant registered in some the other departments for taking sanitary works directly. PW-2 further deposed that sanitary and water supply work was done as per satisfactory norms for which they recognized defendant only and it is the defendant who has to confirm to what extent plaintiff has done this work. PW-2 further deposed that the certificate (Ex PW-1/3) was not any completion certificate and that the said certificate does not make plaintiff to take any sort of benefit and that plaintiff has informed that the said certificate is required for registration in the Government Departments and since plaintiff has done some works, they issued certificate in good faith.

9.4 Thus, from the aforesaid testimony of PW-2 coming in his cross-examination, the certificate (Ex. PW-1/3) does not entail any benefit to the plaintiff viz-a-viz the defendant. It is to be noted that

since there existed privity of contract only between plaintiff and defendant, the completion certificate, if any, would be given by the defendant only and such document issued by the defendant would be material for the claim of plaintiff against the defendant. It is relevant to mention cross-examination of PW-1 (who is the grand-son of the plaintiff), wherein he has stated that defendant has not issued any letter with regard to the satisfaction of the works completed by the plaintiff nor did the defendant issued any certificate/ acceptance with regard to the completion of the work. He has also deposed that there is no written communication to the plaintiff by the defendant asking for completion certificate. He also deposed that he is not aware whether plaintiff has asked for such a certificate/ acceptance. It is to be further noted that there is no pleading to the effect that plaintiff has asked for such certificate/ acceptance as at the time of the filing of the suit, plaintiff, being alive, has himself filed the plaint alongwith the supporting affidavit. The necessary inference is that plaintiff has not asked for such certificate nor the same was issued by the defendant to the plaintiff.

9.5 It is further to note that while plaintiff has alleged to have raised bills/ invoices Ex. PW-1/2 (colly.), the same were raised on regular intervals i.e. on 16.02.2008, 11.03.2008, 18.03.2008, 16.04.2008, 10.04.2008, 01.07.2008, 01.09.2008 and 25.10.2008. It is admitted by the plaintiff that plumbing works had been completed

on 30.11.2008, however, the final bill was raised on 20.10.2010. There is no explanation as to why final bill was raised nearly after 2 years of the completion of the works.

9.6 Even if going by the version of the plaintiff that repair works were to be done at the site for a period of 1 year after the completion of the work, there is nothing shown by the plaintiff that prevented the plaintiff from raising the final bill, that too for an alleged pending amount of Rs.20,60,955/-. The amount claimed via bill (Ex. PW-1/4) is a huge amount as compared to the amounts in the running bills Ex. PW-1/2 (colly) raised by the plaintiff. As to why plaintiff permitted such a huge amount to be accumulated, there is no explanation.

9.7 There is no mention as to how running bills Ex PW-1/2 (colly.) were approved for payment and by what mode the payment was made by the defendant. In the bills Ex. Pw-1/2 (colly.) and Ex. PW-1/4, there is a mention of payment being made to some persons directly by the defendant. The said persons have not been brought in the witness box to prove or corroborate the factum of alleged works mentioned in the running bill Ex. PW-1/2 (colly.) and final bill Ex. PW-1/4, being done by the plaintiff.

9.8 Further more, there is no acknowledgment or acceptance of the final bill Ex. PW-1/4 by the defendant. Mere issuance of

certificate Ex. PW-1/3 by IIM Lucknow/Noida Campus is not enough to fasten liability on the defendant since, as already discussed above, there was not privity of contract between the plaintiff and IIM Lucknow / Noida.

9.9 Moreover, certificate is not reflective of the complete execution of the plumbing works allotted to the plaintiff by the defendant. When the plumbing works has been allotted to the defendant by IIM Lucknow/ Noida, the issuance of certificate Ex. PW-1/3 to the plaintiff, who was employed by the defendant, with no privity of contract between the plaintiff and the IIM Lucknow/ Noida Campus, does not hold much credibility as far as fixing of liability against the defendant or endorsing the claim of the plaintiff, is concerned.

9.10 Merely raising of the final bill is not enough, it needs to be proved by evidence that plumbing works for which claim is made by raising of final bill Ex. PW-1/4, was done and completed by the plaintiff. No positive evidence regarding completion of the work has been led on behalf of the plaintiff. There is also nothing on record from where it can be inferred that the alleged plumbing works for which the claim has been made in the present suit, have been accepted or acknowledged by the defendant.

9.11 There is no certificate or acknowledgment issued by the defendant or its representatives showing plumbing works being completed by the plaintiff to the satisfaction of the defendant. Moreover, raising the final bill Ex PW-1/4 just after issuance of certificate Ex. PW-1/3, also raises a suspicion when there is no explanation as to why no bill was raised for nearly 2 years after the completion of the work. It is also to be noted that there is complete absence of correspondence by the plaintiff with the defendant after the completion of work in 2008 till 2010 just after issuance of certificate Ex. PW-1/3. The said absence of the correspondence by the plaintiff with the defendant also raises suspicion about the genuineness of the claim of the plaintiff.

9.12 In view of the above discussions, the issue under discussion stands decided against the plaintiff.

Issue no. 4

Whether the plaintiff carried out any additional job to the defendant company? OPP

10. Onus to prove this issue was upon the plaintiff.

10.1 In the plaint, plaintiff has averred that he was also made to carry out some additional jobs by the officials of the defendant under

the assurance that each and every payment would be cleared at the time of final bill. The same was reiterated in the deposition tendered by way of affidavit by PW1 (who is one of the LRs of the deceased plaintiff). In the cross-examination, PW1 has deposed that there was no written commitment made by the site Engineers to make additional payments of the excess work got done over the site and further that he is not aware if instructions for the additional work is given in writing or verbally. He has also further deposed that he cannot point out the details of the excess work mentioned in the bill, however, the details have been mentioned in the bills attached as Ex.PW1/4 (Final Bill dated 20.10.2010).

10.2 In the light of the aforesaid deposition of PW1, on perusing the final bill Ex.PW1/4, it is found that there is no specific mention of the additional or ancillary works done at the site by the plaintiff, as distinguishable from the plumbing works alleged to have been allotted to the plaintiff. In the facts and circumstances, it cannot be discerned that any additional works/job was done by the plaintiff and, therefore, the necessary inference is that it has not been proved that plaintiff has carried out additional job at the site. Resultantly, the said issue stands decided against the plaintiff.

Issue no. 2

Whether the plaintiff failed to complete the assigned works on

time and has left some work which was got completed by the defendant by hiring separate work force? OPD

11. Onus to prove this issue was upon the defendant.

11.1 In the light of findings on issues no.4 and 5, since plaintiff has failed to prove that the plumbing works as mentioned in the final bill Ex.PW1/4, were completed by him and also since in view of the discussion on issue no.5, there has a reasonable suspicion on the genuineness of the said bill, on the balance of probabilities, the present issue stands decided in favour of the defendant. Moreover, since plaintiff has alleged that the plumbing works were completed in all respects by him, no independent witness has been called on behalf of the plaintiff, more particularly the labour and/or mason employed by the plaintiff to execute the sanitary works. Thus, the present issue stands decided in favour of the defendant and against the plaintiff.

Issue no.3

Whether the defendant has made full and final payment against work done by the plaintiff? OPD

12. Onus to prove this issue was upon the defendant.

12.1 In the light of detailed discussion on issues no.4 and 5, when it stands proved that plaintiff has not been able to prove that the

plaintiff carried out the work of Rs.20,60,955/- and that plaintiff carried on any additional job, the averment and deposition thereof on behalf of the defendant to the effect that for the actual works done at the site by the plaintiff, payment has been made, has gone unrebutted. In view of the same, the present issue stands decided in favour of the defendant and against the plaintiff.

Issues no. 1

Whether the suit of plaintiff is without any cause of action?

OPD

Issue no. 6

Whether the plaintiff is entitled to recover the suit amount from defendant? OPP

13. Both these issues are taken up together being dependent on the findings on the other issues framed in the present suit. Onus to prove issue no.1 is upon the defendant and issue no.6 is upon the plaintiff.

13.1 In view of the detailed discussions on the other issues framed in the present suit i.e. issues no.2, 3, 4 and 5 and the findings arrived thereupon, it can be clearly concluded that suit of the plaintiff is without cause of action and plaintiff is not entitled to recover the suit amount from the defendant. Accordingly, the issues no.1 and 6 stands decided in favour of the defendant and against the plaintiff.

Relief

14. In view of the above discussion, this suit of the Plaintiff is dismissed. No order as to costs.

15. Decree-sheet be prepared accordingly. Parties are left to bear their own cost.

16. File be consigned to record room after necessary compliance

**Announced in the Open Court
on 15.11.2025**

Digitally signed
by MUNISH
BANSAL
Date:
2025.11.15
16:22:02
+0530

(Munish Bansal)
District Judge-03, South District,
Saket Courts, New Delhi