



\$~25

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CNR No. DLHC010502712024

+ **CRL.REV.P. 1018/2024**

AMIR KADRI ALIAS AMIR KHANPetitioner

Through: Counsel (appearance not given)

versus

ZEBA AHMED & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Suhail Khan and Ms. Vratika
Mittal, Ms. Farid Ahmed Nizami,
Ms. Mariam Nizami and Mr.
Sankalp Malik, Advs. for R-1 and 2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

% **14.08.2026**

1. On 23.03.2026, the following order was passed by this Court in the present petition:

“1. Learned counsel for the petitioner has addressed arguments at a considerable length, however, he seeks, and is granted, a period of two weeks for addressing remaining arguments physically.

2. Prima facie, this Court is not convinced with the arguments addressed by the learned counsel for the petitioner, primarily, since the present petition is more in the nature of an appeal, and by way of the present petition, the petitioner is asking this Court to delve into the aspects of mode of calculation as also the inference drawn on the basis thereof. The same are beyond the realm of a revisional jurisdiction.

3. Be that as it may, petitioner, who is present in person, without prejudice to his rights and contentions, submits that he shall transfer an amount of Rs.50,000/- in the bank account of the respondents within a period of fifteen (15) days.”

[Emphasis supplied]



2. Thereafter on 29.04.2026, once again, the following order was passed:

“1. This Court has heard learned counsel(s) for the parties at length.

*2. Taking into consideration the pendency of the proceedings and as submitted on behalf of the respondents that since there are huge arrears of almost Rs.35 lakhs, which, though is disputed by learned counsel for petitioner, but without entering into the merits involved, **the petitioner is directed to deposit an amount of Rs.5,00,000/- within a period of two weeks and a further amount of Rs.5,00,000/- within a period of two weeks thereafter.***

3. Considering the request made by the learned counsel for the parties, they are referred for negotiation talks before the Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre on 06.05.2026, wherein the parties and/ or their representatives/ counsels shall be allowed to join/ appear either through video conferencing or physically.”

[Emphasis supplied]

3. Thereafter, though an application for modification/ clarification of order dated 29.04.2026 was listed as late as on 06.07.2026, this Court passed the following order:

*“**CRL.M.A. 19027/2026** (By petitioner for modification/ clarification of order dated 29.04.2026)*

1. By virtue of the present application, the petitioner seeks modification/ clarification of order dated 29.04.2026 passed by this Court with regard to the monetary condition of depositing Rs. 10,00,000/-.

2. Considering the assertions made and the arguments addressed qua the inability of the petitioner to clear the arrears already pending, and since no ground for modification is made out, the present application is dismissed.”



[Emphasis supplied]

4. In view thereof, on 16.07.2026 the following order was passed:

“1. Respondent no.2, present in person, submits that mediation inter se the parties has failed. He also submits that the petitioner has not deposited any amount in compliance of the order dated 29.04.2026 passed by this Court, despite the subsequent order dated 06.07.2026 whereby his application seeking modification thereof was also dismissed by this Court.

2. In view of the aforesaid, and considering the factual matrix involved, the stay operating in favour of the petitioner by virtue of order dated 02.04.2025 passed by this Court is hereby vacated.”

[Emphasis supplied]

5. The position today is that despite repeated directions issued to the petitioner by this Court as aforementioned, till date, the said amounts have yet not been deposited by him in blatant disregard for the orders passed by this Court.

6. In fact, today, once again learned counsel for the petitioner seeks another adjournment on the pretext that an SLP has been filed before the Hon’ble Supreme Court.

7. Considering the conduct of the petitioner, and since, with all due respect, mere filing of an SLP almost a month back is no reason to seek adjournment, subject to the petitioner depositing Rs.10,000/- to Delhi High Court Staff Welfare Fund [A/C 15530110074442; IFSC UCBA0001553] within a period of *two weeks*, renotify on 30.10.2026.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J.

AUGUST 14, 2026/Ab