



\$~77

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

+ **CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 305/2025 & CRL.M.A. 2265/2026**

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. Rajiv Bajaj, Mr. Udit Mehra, Mr.
Naman Arora, Ms. Shivani, Mr.
Shubham Bhati and Mr. Aditya
Kumbhaj, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

ORDER

% **21.04.2026**

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

1. At the outset, learned counsel for respondent lodges serious objection that the petitioner made false endorsement on the Index dated 17.04.2026 of this application, stating that advance copies have been served on the party and through counsel whereas the counsel was not served with the advance copy and in the case of party, the petitioner deliberately mailed the advance copy to a false address by inserting the letter 'l' after 'Pekhna Sethi', instead of writing numeric '1' after that name.
2. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that it was only a clerical error.
3. The fact remains that the copy of this application was served on counsel for respondent yesterday, as per both sides.
4. Learned counsel for respondent submits that he has serious objections



to this application and wants to file reply. It is explained by learned counsel that the document at pdf page 854 of the paper book, annexed as additional documents with this application is a forged document and in this regard, he has made oral submissions with the help of stamps downloaded by him from the website.

5. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that as per relevant rules, it takes three days to get e-inspection of the judicial file and since the present application was filed on 18.04.2026, the counsel for respondent must explain as to how he obtained e-inspection and is able to disclose *pdf* numbers of the document.

6. The reply be filed within three days. **It is made clear that the period of three days is being allowed to file reply because according to learned counsel for petitioner, he would need three days to obtain e-inspection of file, for which the matter was adjourned yesterday.**

7. It is stated by learned counsel for petitioner that since according to counsel for respondent, he consulted some CA in Germany and conducted internet search with regard to the alleged forgery, the counsel must be called upon to disclose particulars in the reply.

CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 305/2025 & CRL.M.A. 19474/2025 (stay)

8. Learned counsel for petitioner also submits that he has filed an application seeking to discharge Mr. Rajiv Bajaj, Advocate as counsel for respondent but that application is yet to be listed, so Mr. Bajaj, Advocate be directed to file reply as and when the same gets listed. The application is yet to be listed for even preliminary hearing.

9. **The above submissions convey an impression that neither side wants this matter to be heard and decided expeditiously. It is conveyed**



to both sides that as a matter of judicial discipline, it must be ensured that the matter gets decided on merits expeditiously, as directed by the Supreme Court.

10. **It is 04:55pm.**

11. Under these circumstances, relist on 24.04.2026 in Advance List.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

APRIL 21, 2026

'rs'