



\$~19

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CONT.CAS(C) 216/2012**
UNIVERSITY OF DELHI

.....Petitioner
Through: Mr. Mohinder J.S. Rupal, Mr. Hardik
Rupal and Ms. Aishwarya Malhotra,
Advs.

versus

ASHVIN CHADHA & ORS

.....Respondents
Through: Mr. Ramesh Singh, Sr. Adv. with Mr.
Amit Sethi, Adv. for R-1 & R-2
Mr. Biju Shankar, Adv. for R-3 along
with Mr. Pawan Jaggi, President of
R-3

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER
27.11.2024

%

1. According to the petitioner in terms of the order, which is stated to be wilfully disobeyed by Atma Ram Trust, the petitioner University was to get a total sum of Rs.1.38 crores in all and the University has already received a sum of Rs.69 lacs from the abovesaid Trust.
2. According to Trust, the abovesaid amount was to be shared by 'Atma Ram Trust' and 'Sanatan Dharam Sabha' in equal proportions.
3. The question which now survives is whether Sanatan Dharam Sabha was ever directed or under any legal obligation to make payment of the

CONT.CAS(C) 216/2012

1



balance amount of Rs.69 lacs or not.

4. It is noticed that based on some minutes of meeting dated 05.02.1988, the relevant portion of which was extracted in order dated 12.09.2023, *Sanatan Dharam Sabha* was impleaded as respondent no.3 in the present matter and the Authorized Representative of the said Sabha was directed to appear in person.

5. Learned counsel for petitioner University, however, submits that the University never conceded that *Atma Ram Trust* was responsible for 50% of the amount only. It is submitted that respondent no.3 was impleaded merely on the basis of the submissions made by the learned counsel for Atma Ram Trust and even if there was some kind of *internal arrangement* between Atma Ram Trust and Sanatan Dharam Sabha, in view of the order in question, the primary and sole responsibility of clearing the entire responsibility vests with Atma Ram Trust only.

6. The said assertion has, however, been disputed by Mr. Ramesh Singh, learned Senior Counsel for respondent Trust.

7. Be that as it may, this matter requires further deliberation.

8. Renotify for further consideration on 03.02.2025 at 3:30 p.m.

9. Since the response has already been, reportedly, filed by Sanatan Dharam Sabha and since the issue involved is little complex, permission is granted to the University and respondent nos.1 and 2 to file additional affidavit, if any, within four weeks from today with advance copy to learned counsel for respondent no.3. It seems that since the reply by respondent No.3 has been filed today only, the same is not on record. The fact remains that other learned counsel have received the advance copy of such reply. Respondent No.3 shall pursue with the registry and have it placed on record.



10. Mr. Biju Shankar, learned counsel for respondent no.3 also apprises that the Authorized Representative is present today. He need not appear on next date.

MANOJ JAIN, J

NOVEMBER 27, 2024

ns

CONT.CAS(C) 216/2012

3