



\$~1

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

+ **CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 305/2025**

JASKIRAT SINGH SETHI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mayank Arora, Mr. Jai Allagh,
Mr. Saksham Tyagi and Mr. Amit
Lakhani, Advocates.

versus

PEKHNA SETHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Udit Mehra, Mr. Rajiv Bajaj, Mr.
Anupam Singh and Mr. Aditya,
Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

ORDER

% **25.04.2026**

CRL.M.A. 2265/2026 (for orders/directions)

1. By way of this application, the revisionist seeks permission to place on record rejoinder and annexures. Although, there is no scope for filing any reply and/or rejoinder in revision proceedings, keeping in mind that the predecessor bench had permitted the respondent to file reply, the application is allowed and rejoinder dated 16.11.2025 is taken on record.

2. However, as regards the annexures, it is contended by learned counsel for respondent that many of those are not on trial court record, so the same cannot be looked into. After examining each annexure, both sides agree that Annexures P-4, P-7, P-8 and P-11 be rejected from consideration as the same were not before the trial court.

3. The rejoinder is extraordinarily bulky, running into 64 pages. Strictly speaking, the same travels much beyond what is expected in a rejoinder. It is more of detailed commentary. But rejecting the rejoinder would cause



further delay and I am conscious of the directions from the Supreme Court for expeditious disposal. It is expected that both sides shall adhere to only the relevant portions so that the matter be decided within time directed by the Supreme Court.

CRL.M.A. 12205/2026 (for orders/directions)

4. By this application, the revisionist seeks condonation of delay in filing the additional documents and affidavit for which direction was issued on 01.04.2026.
5. Reply to this application was filed by respondent, strongly opposing the application.
6. It is now lunch time. Resume after lunch.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

APRIL 25, 2026/ry

At 02:30 pm

Present: Mr. Mayank Arora, Mr. Jai Allagh, Mr. Saksham Tyagi and Mr. Amit Lakhani, Advocates for petitioner
Mr. Udit Mehra, Mr. Rajiv Bajaj, Mr. Anupam Singh and Mr. Aditya, Advocates for respondent

CRL.MA 12845/2026 (filed by petitioner seeking discharge of counsel for respondent)

7. This application has been filed by petitioner, levelling certain serious allegations of professional misconduct against counsel for respondent.
8. On the next date, learned counsel for petitioner shall address on maintainability of such application against the backdrop of jurisdiction of the Bar Council to deal with such issue and also as to whether in the present proceedings, this court can hold a mini enquiry as regards genuineness of the



electronic record relied upon by the petitioner in support of this application.

CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 305/2025, CRL.M.A. 12205/2026 (for orders/directions) & CRL.M.A. 19474/2025 (stay)

9. On 01.04.2026, both sides were asked to file affidavit disclosing the amount of maintenance, outstanding according to them. The affidavit was to state simply the outstanding amount and not the mode of calculations, which is in dispute and merit based arguments. What was directed was to clarify by way of specific affidavits, only the outstanding amount. But the affidavit filed on behalf of petitioner is again extensive one containing unnecessary pleadings and arguments which is not what was directed. As mentioned in pre-lunch session, even the rejoinder is extraordinarily bulky.

10. As against this, the respondent has filed crisp calculation only explaining the outstanding amount in three pages.

11. The affidavit dated 17.04.2026 of petitioner is rejected, directing the petitioner to file a crisp affidavit relevant to the issue being discussed. The said affidavit be filed by 27.04.2026 by producing the same in Court, so that there is no adjournment on that day.

12. However, according to the learned counsel for petitioner, the outstanding amount, excluding the interest is Rs.24,30,225/-. It is specifically submitted by learned counsel for respondent that the said amount forms part of the execution proceedings already initiated by the respondent. The learned counsel for respondent has disclosed that the said execution proceedings are now listed before Ms. Kavita Bisht, JMFC, Patiala House Courts on 28.04.2026, so that the present petitioner may appear there.

13. Learned counsel for respondent submits that according to his



calculations, the outstanding amount excluding the interest is Rs.46,80,000/- as on 10.04.2026.

14. Awaiting the fresh affidavit of petitioner, relist on 27.04.2026.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

APRIL 25, 2026/as