

IA no.01/26
IA no.02/26
CA no.220/25
Ujjawal vs Manoj Gupta
PS Gokalpuri

21.04.2026

Present: **Sh. Ritaj Kacker** , ld. counsel for appellant.
Respondent Manoj Kumar in person.

An application for issuing direction to the registration authority to renew the fitness of vehicle bearing no.UP-14ET-4502, has been moved by applicant/surety.

Through this application, applicant wants to have fitness certificate renewed but it is not being renewed by the Transport Authority on the ground that he has stood surety in this court and vehicle has been given as an asset of the surety in this court.

Considering the submissions in the application, it is ordered that the fact that surety Vijay, owner of vehicle no.UP-14ET-4502 had stood surety for the respondent in this case, shall not be considered by the Regional Transport Authority as an obstruction in renewing the fitness of the said vehicle, if otherwise, the said fitness certificate can be issued. However, the order of this court as earlier sent to RTO shall remain in force to the extent that further sale or transfer of the vehicle shall not be allowed without orders of the court.

Application stands disposed of.

Cost as imposed upon appellant vide order dt. 01.04.2026 paid vide receipt no.0200820.

An application u/s 391 Cr.PC/432 BNSS for leading additional evidence on behalf of appellant filed. Copy supplied.

Put up for reply/arguments on 20.05.2026.

(PARVEEN SINGH)

ASJ-03(NE)/KKD Courts/DELHI
21.04.2026