



\$~ SB-11

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

+ RFA 556/2025 & CM APPL. 37087-37090/2025
SMT CHETNA SIKDAR

.....Appellant

Through: Present in person

versus

VINOD KUMAR MEHTA

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Jaya Goyal, Ms. Manpreet Kaur,
Advocates for respondent

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER
30.06.2025

%

1. Appellant herein is aggrieved by decree dated 28.05.2025.
2. The impugned judgment and decree would indicate that the decree has been passed while allowing the application moved by the plaintiff under Order XII Rule 6 CPC.
3. The grievance of the appellant is limited to the effect that there was never any such admission by her and, therefore, the decree on the basis of admission, could not have been passed.
4. Learned counsel for respondent/plaintiff appears on advance notice and when asked, it was apprised that, so far, no Execution Petition has been filed. It is, however, submitted that when the *decree of possession* was passed by the learned Trial Court on 28.05.2025, the learned Trial Court had granted time of one month to the appellant herein to vacate the suit property and, therefore,

RFA 556/2025

1



execution petition has yet not been filed.

5. Let short reply/written synopsis be filed within 10 days from today with advance copy to the other side.
6. List before the learned Roster Bench on 15.07.2025.
7. Till the next date of hearing, let no precipitative steps be taken by respondent/plaintiff in relation to their proposed Execution Petition.
8. Be shown in supplementary list.

MANOJ JAIN, J
(VACATION JUDGE)

JUNE 30, 2025/sw/b/SS