

10 CS DJ ADJ 38/24
Meena Devi Vs. Manju

04.04.2026

Present: Sh. Sanjay Verma, Ld Counsel for plaintiff.
Sh. A. K Bhasin, Ld Counsel for defendant no. 1 & 2.

Counsel for plaintiff submits that there is an averment that any amount of more than ₹2 lakhs was paid in cash, the matter is to be intimated to Income Tax Authorities.

Counsel for defendant submits that judgment is prospective in effect and judgment itself clarifies that it is filed with respect to the transaction that has taken place after 01.04.2017.

Part arguments heard on the application.

Affidavit of admission/denial of documents filed on behalf of defendant. Counsel for plaintiff submits that affidavit of admission/denial of documents could not be filed as plaintiff is not keeping well. He prays for some time.

In the interest of justice, four weeks time is granted to plaintiff to file affidavit of admission/denial of documents.

Both parties insist for a longer date.

Accordingly, list for further arguments on **27.07.2026**.

(Abhitosh Pratap Singh Rathore)
DJ-05 (SW)/Dwarka Courts
New Delhi: 04.04.2026