



\$~13

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CS(OS) 865/2023**
RASHMI BAHRIPlaintiff

Through: Mr. Satyam Arora, Advocate

versus

SUNIL SACHDEVA & ORS.Defendants
Through: Mr. Attin Shankar Rastogi and Mr.
Shivkant Arora, Advocates for D-1
Mr. Anirudh Washwa, Advocate for
D-2

CORAM:

DR. JAGMINDER SINGH (DHJS) JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL))

ORDER

%

28.03.2025

CS(OS) 865/2023

1. Matter is listed for compliance of order dated 21.03.2025 regarding signing of the documents to CFSL. The original documents Ex.D-1 (admitted handwriting) and the documents Ex.DW-1/1 to Ex. DW-1/6 has already been submitted to the Registry by the Court Master. Today original plaint with affidavit and vakalatnama are furnished on behalf of the plaintiff showing specimen signature of the plaintiff.
2. The original plaint (with index) is marked as Ex. P-A1, affidavit is marked as Ex. P-A2 and vakalatnama is marked as Ex. P-A3. These documents are having total 75 number of admitted/specimen signatures of the plaintiff and these are numbered as No.1 to No. 75
3. These documents i.e. original plaint (with index), affidavit and vakalatnama are taken on record.
4. During perusal of the hard copy of the plaint, learned counsels for



defendants no. 1 and 2 raised objection to the body of the plaint that back side of page no. 29 of the plaint is not a part of the plaint which has been e-filed and therefore, this page of the plaint is different from the plaint e-filed. It is further submitted by learned counsel for defendants that the signature of the plaintiff at page no. 30 is different from her signatures on other pages.

5. At this, learned counsel for plaintiff submitted that back side page of plaint's page no. 29 is not a part of the plaint and therefore, same has been cut by a black pen line across the page and therefore, same is not to be taken on record as a part of plaint.

6. I have considered the submission and perused the plaint and compared the relevant pages with the e-filed plaint. It reflects that page no. 29 of the e-filed plaint is same as front side of the page no. 29 of the hard copy of the plaint and thereafter page no. 30 of the e-filed plaint is also same to the page no. 30 of hard copy of the plaint filed today. Back side of the page no. 29 in the hard copy is a cancelled page and is not a part of the plaint and therefore, signature on backside of page no. 29 is not numbered qua the purpose of comparison.

7. However, as requested by learned counsel for defendant no. 1, he is allowed to take softcopy of hard copy of the plaint submitted today through his mobile phone and after scanning he will send the copy of the same to learned opposite counsel through Whatsapp/e-mail.

8. Therefore, in compliance of order of Hon'ble Court dated 21.03.2025, Registry is directed to sent the already deposited documents i.e. Ex.D-1 (admitted handwriting), Ex.DW-1/1 to Ex.DW-1/6 (disputed signatures) as well as the documents submitted today i.e. Ex.P-A1 to Ex.P-A3 (admitted/specimen signatures) to the CFSL for the purpose of comparison



and the Director, CFSL is directed to sent the report on comparison of signatures within a period of six weeks.

9. Put up for awaiting the report from CFSL on 07.07.2025.

DR. JAGMINDER SINGH (DHJS)
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL)

MARCH 28, 2025/tp

Click here to check corrigendum, if any