



\$~O-69

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

+ **CS(OS) 320/2025**

NAVNITYA PARKASH GOYAL

.....Plaintiff

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Goyal, Mr. Anand Sen,
Mr. Ashutosh and Ms. Shruti Bansal,
Advs.

versus

SWATI JAIN & ORS.

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. Ashish Gupta and Mr. Rishi
Kapoor, Advs for D-1 and 2.
Mr. Anupam Singh, Adv for D-3/
Bank.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

28.08.2025

**I.A.21181/2025 (BY PLAINTIFF- FOR CORRECTION OF ORDER
DT. 21.08.2025)**

1. The defendant nos. 1 and 2, in their reply dated 22.07.2025, have taken the following position in paragraph no. 16. The same is reproduced as under:-

“16. That the Defendants undertake to maintain the status quo and not alienate the suit property during the pendency of the suit, rendering the appointment of a Receiver redundant. The Defendants are willing to deposit relevant documents such as title deeds with the Court, if so directed, to ensure the property’s protection.”

2. The statement of the learned counsel for the defendant Bank is taken on record, who contends that the Bank is contemplating necessary legal action against defendant nos. 1 and 2.



3. Accordingly, Paragraph 16 of the reply of defendant nos. 1 and 2 shall remain subject to any other legal provision.
4. With the aforesaid clarification, the application stands allowed, and the same is disposed of.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J

AUGUST 28, 2025

aks/sp