

CS DJ 203/18

MUKESH GOYAL

Vs.

SARABJIT KAUR @ SURJIT KAUR AND ORS.

09.06.2022

Present: Sh. Sanjay Padam Jain-Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.
Sh. Vivek Gupta-Ld. Counsel for defendant no. 2.
Sh. Vikar Ahmad-Ld. Counsel for the defendant no. 3.

Ld. predecessor of this court has issued notice to the SDM regarding the valuation of the property. Plaintiff has valued the suit for the purpose of court fees and jurisdiction at Rs. 40 lacs. All the defendants in their respective written statements have raised objections with respect to valuation of the suit property for the purpose of court fees and jurisdiction.

File perused.

Perusal of the record shows that issues were framed on 24.09.2019, however, no issue has been framed with respect to value of the suit property.

Accordingly, an additional issue is hereby framed as under:-

1. Whether suit has not been properly valued for the purpose of court fees and jurisdiction?OPD.

A noting regarding framing of additional issue be also mentioned in the order sheet dated 24.09.2021 so that it does not escape from the attention of the court at later stage. Parties will prove the valuation of the suit property during the course of trial. Accordingly, SDM is discharged of the obligation to send the valuation report.

Today matter is listed for plaintiff evidence also, however, counsel for the plaintiff submits that inadvertently plaintiff has not brought original records and therefore, records cannot be tendered and he is resident of Panipat, Haryana.

In these circumstances, matter is adjourned for plaintiff evidence on **18.10.2022**.

Witness is directed to come along with original documents otherwise appropriate adverse order may be passed.

(Harish Kumar)
ADJ-02/ North/ Rohini Court
Delhi/09.06.2022