



\$~25

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CS(OS) 628/2025**

VANDANA SHARMAPlaintiff

Through: Ms. Tanya Harnal, Adv.

versus

SHAILENDRA SHARMADefendant

Through: Mr. Paritosh Sharma, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

09.02.2026

I.A. 22374/2025 (by plaintiff under Order XXXIX Rules 1 & 2 read with Section 151 CPC)

1. Ms. Tanya Harnal, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the plaintiff submits that *vide* order dated 15.10.2025, the parties were directed by this Court to maintain *status quo* with regard to the suit property.
2. She urges the Court that the said interim order be made absolute during the pendency of the present suit.
3. Mr. Paritosh Sharma, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the defendant submits that he has no objection in case the *status quo* order is made absolute.
4. In view of the above, the order of *status quo* passed by this Court on 15.10.2025 is made absolute during the pendency of the present suit.
5. The application is disposed of.

I.A. 31555/2025 [by defendant under Chapter IV Rule 3 of Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018 seeking condonation of delay of 18 days in re-filing the written statement]

6. The present application has been filed by the defendant seeking condonation of delay of 18 days in re-filing the written statement.



7. Mr. Paritosh Sharma, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the defendant/applicant submits that the defendant was served with summons on 17.09.2025 and the written statement was filed on 14.10.2025 i.e. well within the prescribed period of 30 days.

8. He submits that the delay is in re-filing the written statement. He submits that the delay in re-filing is for a period of 30 days.

9. Ms. Tanya Harnal, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the plaintiff/non-applicant submits that Rule 3 of Chapter 4 of Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018 provides for condonation of delay to the extent of 30 days in aggregate.

10. Having considered the submissions of learned counsels for the parties, this Court finds that the re-filing of written statement is well within the outer limit of 120 days prescribed under the law, therefore, it is a fit case for condoning the delay in re-filing the written statement.

11. Accordingly, the application is allowed and the delay in re-filing the written statement is condoned.

12. The application is disposed of.

CS(OS) 628/2025

13. The written statement is taken on record. The replication is stated to have been filed by the plaintiff.

14. List before the learned Joint Registrar on 28.04.2026 for admission/denial of documents and marking of exhibits.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

FEBRUARY 9, 2026

aj