

23.07.2025

CS No. 16846/16
Deepak Bansal vs. NDMC

Present: Sh. Piyush Mittal, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.
Sh. Arman Monga, Proxy counsel for the defendant.

Ld. Counsel for the defendant has argued on the point of Issue no. 1 i.e. Whether the suit is barred by law?

Ld. Counsel for the defendant has argued that the work order was placed upon the plaintiff on 22.03.2010 and the time of completion of work was 10 months in terms of the work order dated 22.03.2010.

It is accordingly submitted that the present suit which has been filed on 07.04.2015 is beyond the period of limitation and is accordingly barred by law.

Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff, on the other hand, has submitted that extension of time was granted by the defendant to the plaintiff and as per the same, the work in terms of the work order dated 22.03.2010 was required to be completed on or before 31.12.2012.

It is further submitted on behalf of the plaintiff that the work infact was completed on 04.12.2012.

Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff in support of his contentions, has relied upon the cross-examination of DW-1 dated 21.12.2021 and 20.09.2022 whereby it has been admitted by the witness that the extension of time was granted upto 31.12.2012 and the work was infact completed on 04.12.2012.

Accordingly, the present suit which has been filed within a period of 3 years from the date of completion of the work in terms of the EOT granted is thus the within the period of limitation.

Accordingly, Issue no. 1 is decided in favour of the plaintiff and against the defendant.

Part arguments on Issue no. 2 heard.

Renotify for further arguments on **08.09.2025**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central,
THC, 23.07.2025