



\$~91

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 305/2025, CRL.M.A. 19474/2025, CRL.M.A. 2265/2026 & CRL.M.A. 12205/2026**

JASKIRAT SINGH SETHI

.....Petitioner

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

versus

PEKHNA SETHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajiv Bajaj, Mr. Udit Mehra, Mr.
Naman Arora, Mr. Aditya Kumbhaj
and Mr. Vishant Prakash, Advocates

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

ORDER
20.04.2026

%

1. Today also, like on last two dates, this matter was taken up out of turn after completion of bail/parole matters. On last date i.e., 17.04.2026, none appeared for either side and passover was not possible as I had to proceed to National Judicial Academy, so the matter was posted for today.
2. In compliance with order dated 01.04.2026, both sides filed their respective affidavits and documents, though the affidavit of the petitioner was belated, so the same was filed with the application for condonation of delay. Learned counsel for petitioner undertakes to supply a copy of that application (*Crl. M.A. 12205/2026*) to counsel for respondent today itself.



But, learned counsel for petitioner submits that in the other court pertaining to other proceedings, he has filed an application seeking discharge of the counsel for the present respondent, namely Mr. Rajiv Bajaj, Advocate. But admittedly, in the present case, no such application has been filed and in the other case also, the application remains pending, so it is directed that the copy of the subject application be supplied to Mr. Rajiv Bajaj, Advocate today itself.

3. With the above background, I have partly heard learned counsel for petitioner till this time (04:50pm) but now learned counsel for petitioner seeks adjournment to take e-inspection of the records so that he may respond to the queries appropriately. At this stage, learned counsel for petitioner submits that he did not take e-inspection earlier as the Hon'ble Supreme Court order was communicated to this Court on 18.04.2026. But, this is completely wrong since the Hon'ble Supreme Court order was received by this Court on 17.04.2026 itself. Be that as it may, as requested by learned counsel for petitioner, there is no reason to deny him opportunity to take e-inspection of the records.

4. Accordingly, relist on 21.04.2026 after the bail matters.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

APRIL 20, 2026/as