



\$~12

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

+ CS(COMM) 635/2023 & I.A. 17627/2023 I.A. 7016/2024 I.A. 10447/2024 I.A. 36982/2024 I.A. 37234/2024 I.A. 37235/2024 I.A. 37289/2024 I.A. 37291/2024 I.A. 37295/2024 I.A. 23395/2025 I.A. 23475/2025

KAPLAN, INC.

.....Plaintiff

Through: Ms. Rima Majumdar, Mr. Abhishek
and Ms. Deboleena Dutta, Advs.

versus

GALAXY BOOK CENTRE & ORS.

.....Defendants

Through: Mr. Anirudh Ramanathan and Mr.
Omkar Kanegao, Advs. for D-2
Mr. Dharmendra Sharma, Adv. for D-
3, 5 and 6
Mr. Shankar Kumar Jha, Adv. for D-4
(Through VC)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

19.09.2025

I.A. 10447/2024

1. Mr. Anirudh Ramnathan, Advocate has entered appearance on behalf of defendant no. 2. He states that a compliance affidavit dated 26.08.2025 in compliance of order dated 06.08.2025, has been e-filed; however, the same is lying under objection. He is directed to have the same placed on record within one (1) week.

The delay in filing the affidavit is condoned.

2. He states on instructions that document no. 3 annexed with I.A.



10447/2024, which shows that the payment was received by one Mr. Arvind Dhadhi is a person unknown to defendant no. 2. He states that therefore the allegations made on the basis of that payment in the application by the plaintiff are bereft of merits.

3. He also relies upon the said assertions made on oath in I.A. 23475/2025 filed by defendant no. 2.

4. In reply, learned counsel for the plaintiff has handed over a copy of attendance sheet filed by the Local Commissioner before this Court, which records that Mr. Arvind Murji Dhadhi is an employee working with defendant no. 2. This employee was present during the execution of the local commission.

4.1. She states that it clearly shows that the sale transaction evidenced by document no. 2 annexed with I.A. 10447/2024, was carried out at the behest of defendant no. 2 after passing of the injunction order dated 13.09.2023.

5. In response, learned counsel for the defendant no. 2 seeks an adjournment to take instructions. He states that he had not been instructed that Mr. Arvind Dhadhi is an employee of the defendant no. 2.

6. Having heard the counsels for the parties. It is apparent that defendant no. 2 stand with respect to Mr. Arvind Dhadhi is false.

7. Defendant no. 2 is directed to be personally present in Court on the next date of hearing.

8. Learned counsel for the defendant no. 2 seeks and is granted three (3) weeks' time to file reply to this application. It is ordered accordingly.

9. List on **08.12.2025**.

I.A. 23395/2025

10. This is an application under Section 151 of the Code of Civil



Procedure, 1908 filed by the defendant no. 3 for filing affidavit of undertaking in terms of the order dated 19.08.2025 passed in I.A. 20158/2025.

11. Learned counsel for defendant no. 3 states that the dues of the landlord have been cleared.

12. Learned counsel for the plaintiff states that the plaintiff is satisfied with the undertaking.

13. The application is allowed and the affidavit of undertaking is taken on record.

14. With the consent of the plaintiff and defendant no. 3, the date for carrying out the directions issued vide order dated 19.08.2025 is re-fixed for 24.09.2025 at 11:30 AM.

15. With the aforesaid directions, this application stands disposed of.

I.A. 36982/2024

16. This is an application filed by the plaintiff under Order XXIX Rule 2A of CPC against defendant no. 4.

17. Mr. Shankar Kumar Jha, Advocate enters appearance on behalf of defendant no. 4. He is directed to file his reply within three (3) weeks.

18. Rejoinder, if any, be filed within two (2) weeks thereafter.

19. Learned counsel for the defendant no. 4 seeks and is granted (3) weeks' time to file its affidavit of compliance in I.A. 36982/2024.

CS(COMM) 635/2023

20. List on **08.12.2025.**

21. The digitally signed copy of this order, duly uploaded on the official website of the Delhi High Court, www.delhihighcourt.nic.in, shall be treated as a certified copy of the order for the purpose of ensuring compliance. No



physical copy of order shall be insisted by any authority/entity or litigant.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J

SEPTEMBER 19, 2025/hp/MG