

**Anita Talwar Vs. Richa Talwar**

**07.04.2022**

Present:       None for the appellant.  
                  Sh. Ramit Malhotra, Ld. Counsel for the respondent.

It is stated by the counsel for the respondent that the final order on the application of the plaintiff in CS No. 678/21 titled as Richa Talwar Vs. Goldy Chopra has been passed on 31.08.2021 and an appeal qua this order has been already filed by Smt. Anita Talwar and the same is pending before the court of Sh. Satish Kumar, Ld. ADJ-01, North District, Rohini Courts, Delhi. Copy of the order and copy of appeal have been placed on record.

As none has appeared on behalf of the appellant, therefore, it appears that he is not interested in pursuing the present matter. Further, even otherwise, now the present appeal has become infructuous as the appellant has already preferred another appeal against the final order of interim application passed by the Ld. Trial Court as the present appeal is regarding the impugned order of 17.07.2021 and 23.07.2021 which were passed for time being by the Ld. Trial Court.

In this circumstance, the present matter stands dismissed in default as well as also become infructuous.

**Appeal file be consigned to Record Room.**

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 58554/16**

**M/s Dutsche Motoren Pvt. Ltd.**

**Vs.**

**Sachin Jain**

**07.04.2022**

Present:       None for the parties.

Matter is received back from Mediation Centre as settled.

Copy of the settlement received. Same is perused.

The settlement arrived between the parties in Mediation cell is Ex.P1. Both the parties shall be bound by the terms of Ex.P1.

In the light of the settlement arrived between the parties, the present matter stands disposed off being settlement and the Mediation order be read as part of decreesheet. Decreesheet be prepared accordingly.

Since the matter has been amicably settled between the parties in Mediation Cell, plaintiff is entitled to refund of the Court fees u/s 16 of the Court Fees Act. Necessary certificate be issued in this regard.

Ahlmad is directed accordingly.

**File be consigned to record room.**

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**Kiran Gulati Vs. Shashi Gupta**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Sh. Kapil Gulati, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
Sh. Rakesh Patiyal, Ld. Counsel for the defendant.

It is submitted by the counsel for the plaintiff that there are five connected matters pending between the same parties and all are pending in the court of Sh. Surender Mohit Singh, Ld. ADJ-04, North District, Rohini Courts, Delhi. It is requested jointly to transfer the present suit to the court of Sh. Surender Mohit Singh, Ld. ADJ-04, North District, Rohini Courts, Delhi.

In the light of the above, let the matter be placed before Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge, North District, Rohini Courts, Delhi with request to transferring the same to the court of Sh. Surender Mohit Singh, Ld. ADJ-04, North District, Rohini Courts, Delhi for **08.04.2022 at 2:00 pm.**

Parties are asked to appear before the Court of Ld. Principal District & Sessions Judge, North District, Rohini Courts, Delhi on **08.04.2022 at 2:00 PM.**

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 141/19**

**R.R. Impex  
Vs.  
M/s T.V. Products India Pvt. Ltd.**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Sh. Amit Kashyap, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff alongwith one of the partner, namely, Sh. Sudhir Kumar in person.  
Defendant ex-parte.

Matter is at the stage of ex-parte PE.

PW-1 Sh. Sudhir Kumar is examined and discharged.

Be put up for further ex-parte PE on **01.06.2022**.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**Balram Solanki  
Vs.  
AMSS Power Solution**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Sh. Pawan Kumar, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff alongwith plaintiff in person.  
Intern on behalf of the defendant alongwith Sh. Ajinder Singh, employee of the defendant company

PW-1 plaintiff is present for his cross-examination, however, counsel for the defendant has not available and it is stated that the counsel would appear at 12 noon.

Despite calling the matter, now at 12:20, counsel for the defendant had not appeared and after considering the note of the fact that PW-1 is available for his examination since morning and he is a senior citizen, accordingly, further wait is unjustified and the right to cross examine the PW-1 on behalf of defendant stands closed.

Considering the submission that no other witness would be examined by the plaintiff. PE stands closed.

Be put up for DE on **31.05.2022**.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 167/18**

**Santosh Vs. Ahmed Ali**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
Ld. Counsel for the defendant.

PW-2 Smt. Darshana examined in chief and her  
cross-examination is deferred as requested.

Be put up for PE on **23.07.2022**.

**Sunil Kumar**  
**ADJ-03, Rohini Courts**  
**North District, Delhi**  
**07.04.2022**

**Poonam Tokas  
Vs.  
Phoolwati & Ors.**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Sh. Amit Rana, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
Sh. Dheeraj Bansal, Ld. Counsel for the defendant no. 1  
and 6.  
None for remaining defendants.

Perusal of the record shows that defendant no. 2, 3, 4 and 5 have been served by way of electronic mode in the year 2021. however, by taking the note of the fact that physical summons have not been served, let fresh summons be issued to D-2 to D-5 on filing of PF/RC & Sped Post for **22.07.2022**.

At this stage, without advertng to the merit of the case and to avoid multiplicity of the litigation, the parties to the suits are hereby directed to maintain the status quo qua the ownership and the title of the suit property till NDOH.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 58277/16**

**Master Daksh Chopra  
Vs.  
Varsha Rani**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Sh. Sunil Dahiya, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiffs.  
Defendant no. 1 has already expired.  
None for the other defendants as well as for proposed  
defendant.

Be put up for consideration on the pending applications on

**26.04.2022.**

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 675/18**

**M/s Vinayak Enterprises  
Vs.  
Rumal Singh**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Sh. Amarpal, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
None for the defendant.

Perusal of the record shows that defendant is not appearing before the court since last so many dates, therefore, the defendant is proceeded ex-parte.

Be put up for ex-parte PE on **14.07.2022**.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 58447/16**

**Brahm Datt Verma & Anr.  
Vs.  
Punjab Sind Bank & Ors.**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Ld. Proxy Counsel for the plaintiffs.  
Sh. V.K. Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the defendant no. 2.

Written submission filed on behalf of plaintiffs and defendant  
no. 2.

As counsel for the plaintiffs is not available, therefore, be put  
up for final arguments on **07.05.2022**.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 1493/16**

**Bharat Saini & Anr. Vs. Narain Singh & Ors.**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Sh. Paramveer Chauhan, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiffs  
alongwith plaintiffs in person.  
Sh. Rajiv Thukral, Ld. Counsel for D-3.  
Sh. Arvind Rana, Ld. Counsel for D-6.  
D-1, 2 and 4 are already ex-parte.  
Suit already dismissed qua D-5.

PW-1 Sh. Bharat Saini is present. He is cross examined on  
behalf of Ld. Counsel for D-3 and he is partly cross-examined on behalf of  
D-6 and further cross-examination is deferred at request of witness.

At request, be put up for cross-examination of PW-1 on

**21.04.2022.**

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 59600/16**

**Satbir  
Vs.  
Dinesh Singh Rawat**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Sh. Kunal Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
None for the defendant.

Heard.

Issue fresh summons for judgment to the defendant on filing  
of PF/RC and Speed Post, be returnable on **25.07.2022**.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 60118/16**

**Minda Industries Ltd.**

**Vs.**

**Next First Engineering Technologies Pvt. Ltd. & Ors.**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
Ld. Counsel for the defendants.

Heard.

Let notice be issued to the Local Commissioner to apprise the status of recording of evidence for **NDOH**.

Be listed on **09.05.2022**.

**Ahlmad is directed to place the present suit under the heading of miscellaneous purposes in the cause list.**

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 76/17**

**Vinit Kumar Verma  
Vs.  
Pawan Kumar**

**07.04.2022**

Present: None for the plaintiff.  
Defendant already ex-parte.

Matter is at the stage of ex-parte final arguments.  
Be put up for purpose fixed on **05.05.2022**.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 58222/16**

**Savitri Devi & Anr.  
Vs.  
Bharpai**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Sh. Vineet Rana and Sh. Shubham Ahlawat, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiffs.  
Sh. Anil Kumar, Ld. Counsel alongwith Smt. Sunita Devi, daughter of the deceased defendant.

Steps not taken by the plaintiff in terms of last order.

Let copy of the application for impleadment of LRs of deceased defendant be supplied to the Sunita Devi who is today present in the court.

Let notice of the application be sent to the remaining LRs of deceased defendant on filing of PF/RC, be returnable for **07.05.2022**.

**Steps be taken within 3 days from today.**

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 773/17**

**Romil Jain  
Vs.  
Mohan Lal Chaurasia**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Plaintiff alongwith Ld. Counsel Sh. Rambir Singh.  
None for the defendant.

As per report, the publication of the summons has been carried out in the daily newspaper, namely, "*Veer Arjun*" dated 04.04.2022.

Be put up for appearance of the defendant as well as filing of WS within stipulated period with advance copy to the other party for  
**05.07.2022.**

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 672/18**

**M/s Vinayak Enterprises  
Vs.  
Sunder Singh Khoond**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Sh. Amarpal, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
None for the defendant.

At request, be put up for moving of appropriate application  
for service upon the defendant for **14.07.2022**.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 674/18**

**M/s Vinayak Enterprises  
Vs.  
Radha Krishan**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Sh. Amarpal, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
None for the defendant.

At request, be put up for moving of appropriate application  
for service upon the defendant for **14.07.2022**.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 676/18**

**M/s Vinayak Enterprises  
Vs.  
Raj Krishan**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Sh. Amarpal, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
None for the defendant.

At request, be put up for moving of appropriate application  
for service upon the defendant for **14.07.2022**.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**Pyari Devi Vs. Anil Gupta**

**07.04.2022**

Present: Sh. Arun Dalal, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff alongwith plaintiff  
in person.

Sh. S.S. Saini, Ld. Counsel for the defendant.

Fresh Vakalatnama filed on behalf of defendant. Same is  
taken on record.

Let WS be filed within stipulated period with advance copy to  
the other party.

Be put up for completion of pleadings as well as arguments  
on the interim application on **05.05.2022**.

**Sunil Kumar**  
**ADJ-03, Rohini Courts**  
**North District, Delhi**  
**07.04.2022**

**CS No. 233/22**

**Mohan  
Vs.  
Kamal Kant**

**07.04.2022**

**Fresh suit received by way of assignment. It be checked  
and registered.**

Present: Sh. Pradeep Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.

Heard.

Issue summons of the present suit to the defendant on filing  
of PF/RC & Sped Post for **17.05.2022**.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 234/22**

**Mohan  
Vs.  
Kamal Kant**

**07.04.2022**

**Fresh suit received by way of assignment. It be checked  
and registered.**

Present: Sh. Pradeep Sharma, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.

Heard.

Issue summons of the present suit to the defendant on filing  
of PF/RC & Sped Post for **17.05.2022**.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 219/22**

**Harish Kumar Vs. NDMC & Anr.**

**07.04.2022**

Present:       , Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
                  , Ld. Counsel for the defendant.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No.**

**07.04.2022**

Present:       , Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
                  , Ld. Counsel for the defendant.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 258/22**

**Dharambir  
Vs.  
Krishan Chander & Anr.**

**07.04.2022**

**Fresh suit received by way of assignment. It be checked  
and registered.**

**Present: Sh. Aditya Kaushik, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.**

**Heard.**

**Issue summons of the present suit to the defendants on filing  
of PF/RC & Sped Post for **04.07.2022**.**

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 58566/16**

**Anjana Kohli  
Vs.  
M/s Star News Channel**

**07.04.2022**

Present:       , Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
                  , Ld. Counsel for the defendant.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 492/17**

**Ramesh Goel  
Vs.  
Jai Bhagwan & Anr.**

**07.04.2022**

Present:       , Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
                  , Ld. Counsel for the defendant.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 57910/16**

**Delhi Transco Ltd. Vs. Sandeep Vats**

**07.04.2022**

Present:       , Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
                  , Ld. Counsel for the defendant.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 528/18**

**Vinita Singhal Vs. Mange Ram Sharma**

**07.04.2022**

Present:       , Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
                  , Ld. Counsel for the defendant.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No. 423/21**

**Udit Garg & Anr.  
Vs.  
Vijender & Anr.**

**07.04.2022**

Present: , Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
, Ld. Counsel for the defendant.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**RCA No. 21/21**

**Mhrum Nisha @ Hina  
Vs.  
Om Prakash**

**07.04.2022**

Present: , Ld. Counsel for the appellant.  
, Ld. Counsel for the respondent.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**CS No.**

**07.04.2022**

Present: , Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.  
, Ld. Counsel for the defendant.

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**

**Bharat Saini & Anr. Vs. Narain Singh & Ors.**

**07.04.2022**

**PW-1: Sh. Bharat Saini (Recalled for cross examination after 29.03.2022).**

**ON SA**

**XXXXXXX by Sh. Rajiv Thukral, Ld. Counsel for D-3.**

I am 12<sup>th</sup> pass. I am weak in English. My affidavit Ex. PW1/A was read over to me by my counsel before I signed the same. It is correct that defendant no. 1 has expired during the pendency of the present case. I cannot tell the date and month, however, it could be the year 2018-19 when defendant no. 1 has expired. Defendant no. 1 had three sons and five daughters. Again said. He had six daughters and one had expired. I cannot say whether all the legal heirs of defendant no. 1 were made party in the present suit. No application was moved from my side to implead the legal heirs of defendant no. 1 after his death.

I cannot tell how much property my great-grand-father, Late Manphool Singh was having in his name. My great grandfather, Late Manphool Singh was having three children. Again Said. He was having only one son, namely, i.e. Sh. Narain Singh, defendant no. 1. Again said. He was having three children, namely, Sh. Ram Chander, Sh. Narain Singh, however, I do not remember the name of third son.

Q. I put it to you that Late Sh. Manphool Singh was having six children out of which four were sons and two were daughters. What do you have to say?

A. I do not know about this fact.

**Cont....**

I have the document with me to show the properties in the name of Late Sh. Manphool Singh from whom defendant no. 1 had inherited the same for which the present suit has been filed by me. It is correct that I have not filed any such document on record alongwith my suit or with my affidavit. It is correct that Late Manphool Singh had distributed his properties in favour of his children during his lifetime. It is correct that I have not stated this fact either in my suit or in my evidence by way of affidavit.

I do not know whether I have filed any document on record in relation to the defendant no. 1 name mutated in the Revenue Record. I even do not know whether I have filed on record, the consolidation proceedings by virtue of which the defendant no. 1 inherited the properties of Late Manphool Singh. I cannot tell the details of all those properties of Late Sh. Manphool Singh which were distributed by him in favour of his children during his lifetime.

I have filed a complaint against the defendant no. 3 for hatching the conspiracy to sell out the ancestral property of defendant no. 1 in connivance of defendant no. 4 and 5. I cannot tell the date, month and year when the said complaint was filed by me. It is correct that the complaints Ex. PW1/3 and Ex. PW1/4 do not mention the name of the defendant no. 3 in it. It is correct that no action was taken by the police officials on my abovesaid complaints. It is correct that I did not file any complaint case in the court in relation to my abovesaid complaints when no action was taken by police officials. It is correct that my father as well as father of plaintiff no. 2 are alive. It is correct that the site plan Ex. PW1/5 filed on record does not mention the complete details of the properties of

**Cont....**

defendant no. 1 for which I have filed the present suit. I cannot tell the date, month and year as to when for the first time, I claimed/ demanded my share from the defendant as mentioned in Para no. 5 of my affidavit.

It is wrong to suggest that defendant no. 1 during his lifetime had partitioned his all the properties with his children. It is correct that defendant no. 3 is residing separately from defendant no. 1 and defendant no. 2. I do not remember whether defendant no. 1 entered into any settlement with his sons in the year 2003. I cannot say whether defendant no. 1 agreed to transfer the land measuring 6 bighas out of Khasra bearing no. 156/359 (0-6), 154/686 (2-2), 149/21 (2-8), 50/25 (3-0) and 142/207 (0-4) situated at Village-Puth Khurd, Delhi which was inherited by him from his father Manphool Singh in three equal shares in the name of his three sons. I cannot say whether defendant no. 1 agreed to transfer the plot measuring 2100 sq. yards and 300 sq. yards situated in the Village-Puth Khurd in the name of his three sons. It is wrong to suggest that the defendant no. 1 also agreed to divide the share of the house in which he was residing in four equal shares including him and his three sons. I do not know whether any such settlement was reduced into writing in an application dated 21.09.2003 which was duly signed by defendant no. 1, 2 and 3, Sh. Vijay Singh (Father of plaintiff no. 2), brother of defendant no. 1, namely, Sh. Dharam Singh Saini, Smt. Raj Bala (Wife of defendant no. 3), Smt. Rajwanti (Wife of Sh. Dharam Singh Saini) and neighbours, namely, Sh. Raj Singh, Sh. Prem Singh and Sh. Rajinder and the said applications was given to the SHO PS Bawana, Delhi which was duly acknowledged.

**Cont....**

At this stage, the witness is being shown the photocopy of application dated 21.09.2003 from the court file to which he denies being not aware. Same is marked as Mark X1.

I do not know whether I have placed on record any acknowledgement report to show that complaints Ex. PW1/3 and Ex. PW1/4 were duly received by the concerned offices. It is correct that I have not placed on record the negatives of all those photographs placed on record.

It is wrong to suggest that I do not possess any share in respect to the properties belonging to the defendant no. 1 for which the present suit has been filed, or that I have filed a false and frivolous suit against the defendants. It is wrong to suggest that no consolidation proceedings ever took place or that the defendant no. 1 inherited the properties as mentioned by me in my suit. I cannot reply to the suggestion that the name of defendant no. 1 is not mutated in the Revenue Record. I cannot reply to the suggestion that the defendant no. 3 never raised any construction on plot measuring 300 sq. yards in connivance with defendant no. 4 and 5 as stated in para no. 4 of the affidavit. It is correct that since I do not possess any share in the properties of defendant no. 1 that is why I never claimed any share from defendant no. 1 during his lifetime. I cannot give my reply to the suggestion that the complaints Ex. PW1/3 and Ex. PW1/4 are based on false and fabricated facts and for that reason no action was taken by the police officials. It is wrong to suggest that I have filed the forged and fabricated documents in relation to the properties for which I have filed the false present suit. It is correct that the defendant no. 3 never tried to sell any properties of defendant no. 1 as claimed by me in

**Cont....**

Para no. 12 of my affidavit. Vol. Defendant no. 3 by playing a fraud with defendant no.1 had signed the sale documents. It is correct that I have not placed on record any such document alongwith my suit and evidence by way of affidavit. It is correct that I have not even stated my abovesaid volunteer deposition about defendant no.3 playing fraud with defendant no. 1 and signing the sale documents either in my suit or in my evidence by way of affidavit. It is wrong to suggest that defendant no. 3 did not play any fraud with the defendant no. 1 or that he never signed any such sale document. It is wrong to suggest that I do not possess any share in the properties of defendant no. 1 and I have filed a false and fabricated suit. It is wrong to suggest that the properties mentioned in my suit are not the ancestral properties inherited by defendant no.1 from his father. It is wrong to suggest that the properties mentioned in the suit are the self acquired properties of defendant no. 1 or that I do not possess any share in it.

At this stage, the witness states the plot measuring 300 sq. yards part of Khasra No. 156 is only the ancestral property in which my claim exist, however, I cannot tell about the other properties. It is wrong to suggest that I am deposing falsely.

**XXXXXX by Sh. Arvind Rana, Ld. Counsel for D-6.**

I adopt the cross-examination conducted by Ld. Counsel for defendant no. 3.

**Further cross-examination deferred at request of witness.**

**RO&AC**

**Sunil Kumar  
ADJ-03, Rohini Courts  
North District, Delhi  
07.04.2022**