

11.08.2026

Present: Sh. Parth Chaturvedi (Through VC) & Ms. Jyoti Yadav, Ld. Counsel for the applicant.
Applicant in person.
Sh. T.R Sandhu, Ld. Counsel for the non-applicant.
Sh. Surya Bhushan, Public Relation Inspector,
office of Sr. Superintendent of Post Offices.

Arguments of applicant were recorded in order dt. 20.04.2026.

Today, Ld. counsel for non applicant has argued that the address at which the applicant was served was the correct address. Ld. Counsel for non applicant would rely upon the addresses of Promila and Kiran given by them in their NSC document which are annexed with the original petition at page no. 86 and 83 respectively. Ld. counsel for non applicant also submits that the applicant were well aware about the proceedings in Succession Petition and they approached this court in the present Miscellaneous Application with a considerable delay.

Per contra, Ld. counsel for the applicant submits that there is no doubt and no argument with respect to the fact that address mentioned by the applicants in their NSC was the same at which the summons were sent. Further, there is no argument with respect to the fact that the applicant were served through publication. However, Ld. Counsel would submit that before the applicants were served in succession petition 44/24 the applicants had changed their addresses and they had not intimated the Postal Authorities at NSCs because they were not bound to do so.

Further, Ld. Counsel for the applicant relies upon their affidavit and the Aadhar card at page no. 30 and 31 of their application.

List the matter for clarifications / orders on
18.09.2026.

Pranat Kumar Joshi
ACJ-cum-ARC-cum-CCJ
North-East/Karkardooma Courts,
Delhi/11.08.2026