

Sachin Vs. Satbir & Ors.

Present:- Sh. Dinesh Dayma, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.
Sh. V.K. Dahiya, learned counsel for the defendant No 1 & 4.
Ms. Neha Sirohi, learned GP for defendant No. 2.
Sh. Sudesh Panghal, learned counsel for defendant No. 3.

Previous cost not paid.

Amended title not filed.

Replication not filed. Both the parties were again requested to opt any mode of compromise as envisaged under section 89 of the CPC, but none of the parties showed their interest in amicably settling their matter. Further, they did not opt for admission and denial of the pleadings. From the pleadings of the parties, the following issues are framed:-

1. Whether the plaintiff is entitled to a decree of mandatory injunction as well as permanent injunction as prayed for? OPP
2. Whether the plaintiff has no cause of action to file the present suit? OPD.
3. Whether suit of the plaintiff is not maintainable in its present form and is liable to be dismissed? OPD.
4. Whether the suit of the plaintiff is bad for non-joinder of necessary parties? OPD
5. Relief.

No other issue is pressed or claimed nor arises from the pleadings of the parties. Onus of prove not objected to. Now the case is adjourned to **11.03.2026** for evidence of the plaintiff. The list of witnesses and PF/copy if any be filed within 15 days otherwise the plaintiff will not be entitled for assistance of the Court while summoning the witnesses.

Previous cost of Rs.500/- be also paid to plaintiff by defendant no.2. Previous cost of Rs. 500/- by defendant no. 3 be also paid on date fixed. Amended title be also filed by plaintiff on date fixed.

Date of order: **17.12.2025**

(Abhishek Chaudhary)
CJ(JD)/Gurugram
UID No. HR0534