



\$~9&10

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CS(OS) 2033/2007
MAHAVEER SINGHVIPlaintiff

Through: None.

versus

HINDUSTAN TIMES LIMITED AND OTHERS

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. O. P. Pandey, SDM of
Chankyapuri, Delhi in person

10

+ CS(OS) 2034/2007
MAHAVEER SINGHVIPlaintiff

Through: None.

versus

HINDUSTAN TIMES LTD. AND ORS.Defendants

Through: Mr. O. P. Pandey, SDM of
Chankyapuri, Delhi in person

CORAM:

**JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL) MS. PRIYA
MAHENDRA, (DHJS)**

ORDER

% **02.04.2025**

1. As per office note, Bailable Warrants has been duly served upon SDM concerned. At this stage, Mr. O. P. Pandey, SDM of Chankyapuri, Delhi is present after service of Bailable Warrants upon him. He has placed on record Report/Reply. The same is taken on record.

2. First of all, it is stated in the said Reply that no notice issued by this court has been received by SDM Chankyapuri in the present matter. However, this statement is completely contrary to record because as per record, notice was duly served upon the Dak Clerk of SDM concerned on two occasions i.e. on 05.09.2024 and on 25.10.2024. However, none appeared on behalf of SDM, Chanakyapuri, Delhi

3. Moreover, the aforesaid reply is otherwise incomplete. It is only stated in the reply that the property in



question lies in Block "A" and entire Block "A", has been demolished 2 years before reconstruction and there is no such person named Mahaveer Singhvi available to receive the Notice issued under Section 136 of the Delhi Land Reforms Act, 1954. However, it does not state that what further enquiry was made by SDM concerned to determine that who is presently in occupation and possession of the property and whether the occupant is related to Mahaveer Singhvi in any manner. It shows that substantive efforts have not been made by SDM concerned in this regard. At this stage, SDM Chankyapuri present today personally, undertakes to take all necessary permissible measures available under law for tracing out Mahaveer Singhvi/plaintiff and recovery of deficient court fees amounting to Rs.4.92 lacs qua both the suits. The detailed report in this regard be filed by SDM on or before the next date of hearing. In case of non compliance of the aforesaid order, the SDM concerned is directed to remain personally present on the next date of hearing to render explanation.

4. Re-notify the matter for compliance of the aforesaid order on 17.07.2025.

**PRIYA MAHENDRA (DHJS)
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL)**

APRIL 2, 2025/ab

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)