



\$~17

*

+

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

CS(OS) 593/2012

RAVINDER KAUR CHAWLA

.....Plaintiff

Through: None.

versus

IQBAL SINGH SABHARWAL & ORSDefendants

Through: Mr. Shivam Tiwari, proxy cl. for
Mr. Ashish Dixit, Adv. for D-2
Mr. Nirbhay Narain Singh, Adv.
for D-4

Mr. Subhash Chand & Ms.
Pooja, Advs. for D-5

Mr. Parvinder Singh, Adv. for
D-7

Mr. Manish Kumar & Ms.
Aparajita Jha, Advs. for D-10

CORAM:

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

ORDER

%

18.09.2024

**IA No. 12568/2022 (application filed by defendant no.2
u/S 151 CPC for condonation of delay in re-filing of 170
days in filing the application)**

1. Heard. In the interest of justice and subject to imposition of cost of Rs.3,000/- upon the applicant/defendant no.2 to be deposited with Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee, the captioned IA stands allowed as prayed for. Accordingly, the captioned IA stands disposed of.

**IA No. 12567/2022 (application filed by defendant no.2
u/S 151 CPC seeking production of original documents
at the time of recording of evidence)**

2. The main premise of the captioned IA is that the defendant no.2 seeks permission to bring original documents for which photocopy/typed copy of the documents have been filed by defendant no.2 alongwith Written Statement. Learned respective counsels for



defendant no.5&defendant no.7 have objected to the captioned IA on the ground that details of said documents have not been furnished by the applicant anywhere in the application.

3. At this stage, it is stated by proxy counsel for the applicant/defendant no.2 that the subject matter of the captioned IA are documents mentioned at Sr. No.7,8,11&12 of the List of Documents filed by defendant no.2 alongwith Written Statement vide diary no.123057 dated 30.10.2012. The learned respective counsels for defendant no.5 and defendant no.7 submits that only typed copies of the same have been filed and neither photocopy nor original of the said documents have been filed by the applicant. Heard. To my mind, no prejudice would be caused to the defendant no.5&7, if the captioned IA is allowed. Accordingly, defendant no.2 is directed to produce Originals of the aforesaid documents on the next date of hearing and file photocopy of the aforesaid documents at least two weeks before the next date of hearing with advance copy to the opposite side. Needless to say that the Originals and photocopy of the said documents must be verbatim with respect to the contents of the typed copies on record. It is made clear that the true typed copy already filed on record by the defendant no.2 will become redundant after filing of Original documents and its photocopies in terms of order passed above.

4. At this stage, it is pointed out by learned counsel for the defendant no.10 that the similar order was passed on 15.02.2023 but the same has not been complied by the defendant no.2 till date. Accordingly, the last and final



opportunity is granted to the defendant no.2 to comply the aforesaid order, failing which the defendant no.2 would be burdened with cost of Rs.30,000/-.

Accordingly, the captioned IA stands disposed of.

CS(OS) 593/2012

Re-notify the matter for DE before concerned Joint Registrar on 21.11.2024.

PRIYA MAHENDRA (DHJS)
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL)
SEPTEMBER 18, 2024/ab
[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)