



\$~96

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ RFA 272/2025 CM APPL. 16972/2025 CM APPL. 16974/2025
R K BHUTANI AND SOSNAppellant
Through: Mr. Arun Vohra, Advocate.

versus

KAMAL ARORARespondent
Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

% **ORDER**
27.03.2025

CM APPL. 16973/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application is accordingly disposed of.

CM APPL. 16976/2025 (Condonation of delay)

1. This application has been filed seeking delay of 7 days in re-filing of the appeal.
2. In view of the facts stated in the application, the delay of 7 days is condoned.
3. Application is allowed and accordingly disposed of.

CM APPL. 16975/2025 (seeking extension of time from filing Court Fees)

1. This application has been filed seeking extension of time from filing Court Fees.
2. Subject to the Court Fees being filed within a period of two weeks,



the said

3. Application is allowed.
4. Application is accordingly disposed of.

CM APPL. 16972/2025 (for stay)

1. This application has been filed seeking stay of the operation of the impugned judgment and decree.
2. Counsel for appellant states that decree of *mesne* profits was also directed against them and the principal amount, as per them, is Rs. 33 lacs, while counsel for respondent appears on advance notice and states that total amount would be amounting to Rs. 53 lacs.
3. Accordingly, an amount of Rs. 33 lacs will, therefore, stand deposited within a period of four weeks; subject to the deposit, there shall be *status quo* on the property. Respondent shall be at liberty to assert deposit of further amounts, basis the justification of their respective shares.

RFA 272/2025

1. This appeal has been filed against the judgment and decree dated 28th February 2023 passed by ADJ, South-East, District, Saket Courts in CS/DJ/ No. 11167/2016.
2. Counsel for appellant states that they were defendant no.1 in the said suit. As per impugned preliminary decree, has received a share of 30% however, he contests the claim of 20% share by plaintiff no.2. He states that after the decree was drawn out, it was discovered that plaintiff no.3 (*respondent no.3 herein*) had relinquished their rights *vide* lease deed dated 18th April 2002.
3. A review petition was filed, which was dismissed on 09th January 2025, as being not maintainable.



4. Accordingly, issue notice to the respondents on steps being taken by appellant through all permissible modes including email.
5. List before Joint Registrar (Judicial) on 02nd September, 2025.
6. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

MARCH 27, 2025/RK/kp

Click here to check corrigendum, if any