

12.09.2024

Arbtr No. 473/23
Kuldeep Mukul Shahi vs. HDFC Bank and ors.

Present: Sh. Prakhar, Ld. Counsel for the petitioner.

It is submitted by the counsel for the petitioner that settlement talks have failed.

It is further submitted that the copy of the reply has not been supplied.

Let the same be supplied on or before the NDOH.

List on **27.01.2025**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 10743/16
Pioneer Publicity vs. M/s Nimbus Sport and anr.

Present: None.

Court notice issued to defendant no. 1 and 2 have not been received back as served.

Issue fresh court notice to defendant no. 1 and 2 so as to apprise the court with respect to the liquidation proceedings stated to have been pending against defendant no. 2.

List on **27.01.2025**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 16680/16
Varun Gupta vs. Sumit Mehta

Present: Ms. Nishi Satyarthi, Proxy counsel for the plaintiff a/w PW-1.

Proxy counsel for the plaintiff submits that although the evidence by way of affidavit is ready however, since the same contains some inadvertent errors, she needs sometime to correct the same.

At request, renotify on **30.01.2025**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

Ex No. 420/17
Tushti Gupta and ors vs. UOI and ors.

Present: DH in person.
Sh. K.K Singh, Ld. Counsel for JD no. 1 and 2.
Sh. Saurabh Bhasin, Ld. Counsel for the DDA.

On the LDOH, counsel for the DDA had submitted that he had no objection in case the petition is permitted to be withdrawn in view of the liberty having been granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

Ld. Counsel for the Jds no. 1 and 2 submits that he has no objection in case the present execution petition is dismissed.

DH, present in person submits that in terms of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the DH has already filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

Separate statement of the DH no. 1 i.e. Ms. Tushti Gupta is recorded to this effect.

In the light of the separate statement, **present execution petition stands dismissed as withdrawn.**

File be consigned to Record Room after necessary due compliance.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

Ex No. 420/17
Tushti Gupta and ors vs. UOI and ors.

Statement of Ms. Tushti Gupta, aged about 75 years, W/o Late Sh. Kanti Swaroop Gupta, R/o. House No. 104, Tower 3, Aastha Greens, Greater Noida.

On SA

I am the DH in the present petition. I seek to withdraw the present execution petition. I may be permitted to withdraw the present petition.

RO & AC

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

M No. 81/19
Gurcharan Singh vs. Inderjeet Singh

Present: Sh. T.K Tiwari, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff no. 1(b) a/w plaintiff no. 1(b)
i.e. Bawa Mohindra.
Ms. Smita Jain, Ld. Counsel for the applicant/defendant no. 5.

Ld. Counsel for the defendant no. 5 i.e. the applicant submits that she is not pressing her application filed under Section 151 CPC seeking recall of the order dated 01.12.2018.

The same is accordingly dismissed as withdrawn.

File be consigned to record room after necessary due compliance.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

M No. 81/19

Gurcharan Singh vs. Inderjeet Singh

Statement of Ms. Smita Jain, Enroll No, D/820/12, Mobile No. 9818344461, Office At :- Athena Legal, 37, Link Road, 1st Floor, Lajpat Nagar, Delhi-110024.

At Bar

I am the counsel for the applicant/defendant no. 5 in the present case. On instructions that in view of family settlement, I am not pressing my application under Section 151 CPC seeking recall of the order dated 01.12.2018. I may be permitted to withdraw the same.

RO & AC

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 231/21
Neetu and anr vs. Kanwar Singh and ors.

Present: Ms. Meenakshi, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff through VC.
Sh. R.K Ray, Ld. Counsel for the defendant no. 1.

Since defendant no. 3 is stated to have expired and is survived by 5 LRs out of which LR no. 5 i.e. Smt. Meena is stated to have also expired and is survived by Sh. Yash, Sh. Hiten and Ms. Aditi.

Out of the aforesaid 5 Lrs, Smt. Sunita has only been served.

The plaintiff on the LDOH was directed to served the unserved proposed defendants being the LRs of the defendant no. 3 however, despite directions no steps have been taken.

Today an application has been filed for filing fresh address of the proposed 3 defendants i.e. Ashu, Chinky and Rakhi by the plaintiff.

Let an amended memo of parties be filed.

The plaintiff is directed to serve the unserved proposed defendants on filing of PF/RC/Speed Post.

Renotify on **28.01.2025**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

M No. 215/21, 96/22

Present: Sh. G.P Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.
Mr. Monis Rais, Ld. Counsel for the non applicant.

The matter is listed for arguments on the maintainability of the present contempt petition in terms of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in the matter of Abdul Mueed vs. Hammad Ahmed.

Ld. Counsel for the applicant/petitioner submits that he has been engaged only recently and he needs sometime to argue the present aspect of law.

At request, renotify on **30.01.2025**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 1140/22
Raj Kumar Mehra vs. Sonu and ors.

Present: Sh. Anil Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.
Proxy counsel for the defendants.

The matter was listed for admission/denial of documents.

On the LDOH, the lawyers were stated to be on strike and accordingly it is submitted that the affidavit of admission/denial could not be filed.

Let the order dated 27.03.2024 be complied afresh.

Interim order dated 23.02.2023 to continue till the NDOH.

List on **28.01.2025.**

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 533/23
Seema Jain and anr vs. Rajan Puri and anr.

Present: Sh. Abhay Kaushik, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiffs a/w plaintiffs.
Sh. Rahul Rohilla, Ld. Counsel for the defendants a/w defendants.

There are two pending applications.

The application under Section 151 CPC has been filed on behalf of the defendant no. 1 and the application under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC seeking deletion has been filed by defendant no. 2.

Ld. Counsel for the defendant no. 1 and 2 has filed affidavit of admission/denial of documents.

At this stage, the parties jointly submit that there is a possibility of settlement in the present matter and thus the parties be referred to the mediation.

In view of the same, **the parties are referred to the mediation center and are directed to appear before the mediation centre on 18.09.2024 at 2:00 PM and before the court for report of the settlement, if any, or for further proceedings on 29.01.2025.**

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CC No. 59/23
Rajan Puri vs. Seema Jain and anr.

Present: Sh. Rahul Rohilla, Ld. Counsel for the counter claimant.
Sh. Abhay Kaushik, Ld. Counsel for the non counter claimants.

Ld. Counsel for the non counter claimant has filed affidavit of admission/denial of documents.

At this stage, the parties jointly submit that there is a possibility of settlement in the present matter and thus the parties be referred to the mediation.

In view of the same, **the parties are referred to the mediation center and are directed to appear before the mediation centre on 18.09.2024 at 2:00 PM and before the court for report of the settlement, if any, or for further proceedings on 29.01.2025.**

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 1298/23
Sanjay Sahani vs. Virender Kumar

Present: Sh. Yogesh Kumar Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.

Although affixation is stated to have been carried out at the Delhi address of the defendant. However, as per the report of the process server, the neighbours have stated that they are not aware as to who is residing at the given address.

Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff is directed to serve the defendant at the Bihar Address through the office of the concerned Ld. District and Session Judge, Bihar on filing of PF.

List on **30.01.2025**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 432/24
Ajay Kumar Singh vs. Smita Rathore

Present: Sh. Mohit Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff a/w plaintiff.

The summons issued to the defendant has not been received back. However, as per the RC report, the address of the defendant is stated to be incomplete.

Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff has filed on record an amended memo of parties showing the correct address of the defendant.

Let fresh summons be issued upon the defendant on filing of PF/RC/Speed Post.

Renotify on **04.02.2025**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

RCA No. 105/24
Suresh Gupta vs. Naresh Garg

Present: Sh. Puneet Bhardwaj, Proxy Counsel for the appellant through VC.
Sh. S.C Garg, Ld. Counsel for the respondent.

Proxy counsel for the appellant seeks an adjournment on the ground that the main counsel is not available today.

An early hearing application was filed on 31.08.2024 by the appellant.

However, nobody is present even on the date fixed i.e. today and an adjournment is being sought.

The same is accordingly dismissed.

Renotify for further proceedings on **04.02.2025**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 16455/16

Naresh Gupta vs. Vishal Optics

Present: Sh. Sanjay Goel, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff a/w plaintiff.
Sh. Rahul Madan, Ld. Counsel for the defendant.

On the LDOH, notice was issued to the witness sought to be examined by the plaintiff i.e. M/s Flying Express Courier however, as per the endorsement by the postal authorities, it has been reported that the address is not known.

The plaintiff is directed to file fresh address of the witness.

On filing of the same, fresh summons be issued to the witness.

Renotify for PE on **30.01.2025**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 20155/16
Gagan Chhabra vs. Yatin Pahwa

Present: Sh. Manoj Khatri, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff a/w plaintiff.
Ms. Priyamvada Singh, Ld. Counsel for the defendant through VC.

The matter is listed for remaining PE.

Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff has filed on record an application seeking summoning of the court clerk from the court of Sh. Anuj Kumar Singh, Ld. ACMM, Central District, THC for the records pertaining to the complaint case no. 516456/2016 titled Gagan Chhabra vs. Yatin Pahwa.

The application stands allowed.

Let the same be summoned for the NDOH.

List for remaining PE on **25.01.2025**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 4265/17
Balwinder Singh and anr vs. PNB and ors.

Present:

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 1039/22
Lalit Kumar HUF vs. Swarna Gupta

Present: Sh. Ashish Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.
Proxy counsel for the defendant.

There is a pending application under Order 12 Rule 6 CPC.

Proxy counsel for the defendant submits that he would be filing a reply to the said application during the course of the day and would be supplying the copy of the same to the counsel for the plaintiff.

List for arguments on **27.01.2025**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 600/24
Rajender Kumar vs. Upkar Saini and anr.

Present: Sh. Deepak Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.

Summons sent to the defendant has not been received back as served.

Perusal of the memo of parties show that address of defendant no. 1 has not been provided.

Let a fresh amended memo of parties showing the correct address of the defendant no. 1 be filed.

On filing of the same, the counsel for the plaintiff is directed to take fresh steps to serve the defendants on filing of PF/RC/Speed Post.

He is at liberty to serve the defendants through the office of the Ld. District and Sessions Judge, Bihar.

Renotify on **05.02.2025**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 9926/16
Satish Kumar and anr vs. Govt of NCT of Delhi and ors.

Present: None for the plaintiff.
Sh. Jasbir Singh, Ld. Counsel for the defendant no. 3 a/w witness.
Sh. S.C Jain a/w Mr. S Haider, Ld. Counsel for defendant no. 5.

The matter is at the stage of DE.

As recorded vide order dated 29.07.2024 that the plaintiff has not been appearing in the present matter and who last entered appearance on 28.07.2023.

In the interest of justice, one opportunity was granted to the plaintiff to conduct cross-examination of the witness of defendant no. 3.

The witness Sh. Nagender Shekhar is present.

D3W1 is examined-in-chief.

Nobody is present on behalf of the plaintiff who on the LDOH was granted an opportunity to cross-examine the witness.

Ld. Counsel for the defendant does not wish to lead further DE.

Separate statement of the counsel for the defendant is recorded to this effect.

In view of the separate statement, **DE stands closed.**

List for final arguments on **04.12.2024.**

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 9926/16
Satish Kumar and anr vs. Govt of NCT of Delhi and ors.

**Statement of Sh. Jasbir Singh, Enroll No. D/2113A/2004, Mobile No. 8130328014,
Office At :- M-24, LGF, Lajpat Nagar 3, New Delhi.**

At bar

I am the counsel for the defendant in the present case. On instructions, I am closing DE.

RO & AC

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 9926/16
Satish Kumar and anr vs. Govt of NCT of Delhi and ors.

D3W1: Sh. Nagendra Shekhar, Senior Assistant Vice President, BSES, BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place.

On SA

I tender my evidence by way of affidavit **Ex. D3W1/1**. It bears my signatures at Point A and B. I rely upon the following documents :-

1. **Mark A** is the photocopy of the contract order awarded to M/s Gupta Traders/defendant no. 5. *(the same is de-exhibited from Ex. D3W1/A due to lack of originals)*
2. **Mark B** is the photocopy the complaint register dated 23.07.2012. *(the same is de-exhibited from Ex. D3W1/B due to lack of originals)*
3. **Ex. D3W1/C** is the original report dated 14.02.2013 alongwith photographs.

XXXX NIL opportunity given.

RO & AC

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

Arbtr No. 85052/16
M/s Ess Kay Constructions vs. UOI

Present: Sh. Amit Punj, Ld. Counsel for the petitioner.
Sh. A.K Mishra, Ld. Counsel for the respondent.

Arguments heard.

List for Judgment on **01.10.2024**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 672/20

M/s Printech vs. Mukesh Kumar

File taken up on application.

Present: Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff through VC.

Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff has filed an application seeking summoning of the witness.

The application stands allowed.

List for the date already fixed i.e. on **21.09.2024**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 390/18
ICICI vs. Mukesh

Present: Mr. Yunus Saifi, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff a/w AR of the plaintiff.
Defendant is already ex-parte.

Arguments heard.

List for Orders on **26.09.2024**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 13782/16
Ramesh Chander vs. Liberty Videocon.

Present: Sh. Mukesh Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff through VC.

Part arguments heard.

Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff submits that he would be filing brief written synopsis clearly showing the amount proved and sought to be recovered.

List for further arguments on **09.12.2024**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 75/19
Rohtash vs. Ashok and ors.

Present: Sh. R.K Bharti, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff a/w plaintiff.
Ms. Archana Chibber, Ld. LAC for the defendant a/w Defendants.

D3W1 is examined-in-chief, cross-examined and discharged.

List for remaining DE on **26.10.2024.**

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 75/19
Rohtash vs. Ashok and ors.

D3W1 : Ms. Mamta, aged about 40 years, W/o Late Sh. Sunil, R/o. House No. 106, Ggali No. 3, Wazirabad.

On SA

I tender my evidence by way of affidavit as Ex. D3W1/A. It bears my signatures at Point A and B. Document exhibited in my affidavit as Ex. DW1/1 is not on record and therefore the same is de-exhibited.

XXXX By Sh. R.K Bharti, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.

I do not know the contents of my affidavit Ex. D3W1/A. However, I have signed the same. I have not stated in my affidavit that the plaintiff is not the owner of the suit property. I have not stated in my affidavit that the title documents in favour of the plaintiff are forged and fabricated.

At this stage, **the witness is confronted with the affidavit Ex. D3W1/A wherein it is so recorded** to which after seeing the same, the witness states that I have not stated these facts.

It is correct that I am not the son of the deceased Sh. Sunil. However, in my affidavit it has been inadvertently stated by way of a typographical error that I am the son of the deceased. It is correct that the plaintiff and his family members have been residing in the suit premises prior to my marriage. It is correct that I have no knowledge that how the suit property was purchased by the plaintiff as the same was purchased prior to my marriage. **Vol.** I came to know about the said fact after my marriage. I came to know about the fact that the said property was purchased out of sale proceeds of joint property situated at Trinagar when the plaintiff was having conversation with his children. It is correct that

neither me nor my deceased husband had filed a suit for partition qua the suit property. It is correct that I do not have any document to show that the suit property was purchased out of sale proceeds of joint property at Trinagar. **Vol.** This was a regular talk amongst the family members and every family member is aware of the said fact.

It is correct that at the time when the suit property was purchased, I was not married and I came to know about the said fact after my marriage. I do not remember the khasra no. of the suit property.

The witness is confronted with Para 4 of her affidavit where the khasra no. of the suit property has been mentioned.

I have never said that the documents pertaining to the suit property in favour of the plaintiff are forged and fabricated.

The witness is confronted has been confronted with para 4 wherein said fact has been stated. It is correct that I have stated in my evidence that the suit property is not in the possession of the plaintiff and the plaintiff is in absolute possession of the said property since 1995. However, the said fact has never been stated by me and is incorrect (first 3 lines of para5).

I have been living separately from my in laws for the past 10 years. However, I was taking care of my in laws. It is wrong to suggest that I have made police complaints atleast 10 times against the plaintiff and his family members. **Vol.** I have made one police complaint against the plaintiff and his family members after the demise of my husband when the plaintiffs were throwing away her utensils. M husband expired 8-9 years ago however I do not remember the exact date or the year of his death. However, the same was summer time. I do not remember whether the police complaint was made against the plaintiff and his family members in the year-2021. I filed a domestic violence against the plaintiff and his family members 3-4 years ago. It is correct that the DV Act complaint was preferred by me after having received summons of the present suit. It is wrong to suggest that at the time of filing of the suit, I was in possession of only one room. **Vol.** The kitchen was alongwith the room in my possession.

It is wrong to suggest that I am deposing falsely. It is further wrong to suggest that the cause of the entire quarrel is due to the fact that after the demise of my husband, I have contacted second marriage. It is further wrong to suggest that I have contacted second marriage. It is correct that I have not filed any complaint against the plaintiff and his family members alleging that the plaintiff and his family members are throwing me/dispossessing out from the suit property.

RO & AC

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 9638/16
Gyanendra Singh vs. Govt of Nct of Delhi

Present: Sh. Deepak Khosla, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.
Ms. Binisa Mohanty, Ld. Counsel for the defendant through VC.

Ld. Counsel for the defendant no. 1 and 2 submits that a judgment and decree dated 20.08.2014 has been passed against the defendants whereby they have been permanently enjoined from interfering in any manner in the possession qua shop situated in Khasra no. 637/350 in the revenue estate of village Kotla Mubarakpur, New Delhi.

It is further submitted on behalf of defendant no. 1 and 2 that the said judgment and decree dated 20.08.2014 has attained finality and there is no subsisting cause of action in favour of the plaintiff and against the defendants and the present suit is barred by res judicata, since the defendants stands restrained from interfering in any manner in the possession of the plaintiff in shops situated in Khasra No. 637/350 in the revenue estate of village Kotla Mubarakpur, New Delhi.

In view of the aforesaid, counsel for the plaintiff submits that the present suit be disposed off in terms of the statement made.

In view of the aforesaid submissions made, the present suit is disposed off.

File be consigned to Record Room after necessary due compliance.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

M No. 60580/16
Gyanendra Singh vs. Govt of Nct of Delhi

Present: Sh. Deepak Khosla, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.
Ms. Binisa Mohanty, Ld. Counsel for the defendant through VC.

Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff submits that he does not wish to press his application, the same is hereby dismissed as withdrawn.

File be consigned to Record Room after necessary due compliance.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 767/20
Satpal Sharma vs. Badri Prasad Khanna

Present: Sh. Anant Rao, Proxy counsel for the plaintiff.
Ld. Counsel for the defendant through VC.

A written synopsis filed by the defendant.

Let the copy of the same be supplied to the counsel for the plaintiff.

Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff is also directed to file brief written synopsis with
advance copy to the other side.

List on **19.12.2024**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 91/20
Veena Devi vs. Rani Devi

Present: Sh. Akarsh Sharma, Proxy counsel for the plaintiff.
None for the defendnat.

Proxy counsel for the plaintiff submits that the matter continues to remain pending before the mediation centre of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi.

At request, renotify on **21.01.2025**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 2312/18
Shyam Sunder vs. B.K Dass

Present: Ms. Jyoti Karki, Proxy counsel for the plaintiff.
Proxy counsel for the defendant.

On an application filed by the Lrs of the deceased plaintiff, notice of the application seeking impleadment of the proposed defendant no. 2, notices were issued to the proposed defendant.

However, the same has not been received back as served.

Issue fresh notice to the proposed defendant no.2 as per her address disclosed by defendant no. 1 and as recorded vide order dated 29.05.2024 on filing of PF/RC/Speed Post.

The plaintiff is at liberty to serve the proposed defendant no. 2 through the office of the concerned Ld. District and Sessions Judge, Bihar.

Renotify on **29.01.2025**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 4265/17
Balwinder and anr vs. PNB and ors.

Present: Sh. Mayank Sarin, proxy counsel for the plaintiff a/w plaintiff.
Sh. Rustom Singh, Ld. Counsel for the defendant no.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

CS No. 4265/17
Balwinder and anr vs. PNB and ors.

RO & AC

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

RCA No. 142/18
Rajinder vs. NDMC

Present: Sh. Arman Monga, Ld. Counsel for the appellant.
Proxy counsel for the respondent.

Despite directions, TCR has not been summoned.

In view of the above, issue fresh robkar for the summoning of the main file.

List on **12.12.2024**.

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024

12.09.2024

RCA No. 65, 67 &
68/18

Present:

Sachin Sood
DJ-01, Central, THC
12.09.2024