



\$~72

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

+ **CS(OS) 626/2025 & I.A. 22275/2025, I.A. 23024/2025,
I.A. 25819/2025**

MR. ROMI GARG

.....Plaintiff

Through: **Mr. Jai Sahai Endlaw and Ms.
Shambhavi Kala, Advocates.**

versus

MRS. SHEELA DEVI & ORS.

.....Defendants

Through: **Dr. L.S. Chaudhary, Dr. Ajay
Chaudhary, Mr. Bharat Chaudhary,
Ms. Vinita and Ms. Monika,
Advocates for D-1 and D-3.**

**Mr. Ashish Dholakia, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Shaurya Shyam and Ms.
Ananya Narain Tyagi, Advocates for
D-2.**

**Mr. Sandeep Sethi, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Sanjay Abbot, Ms. Ishma
Randhawa, Mr. Dhananjay Grover and
Ms. Vasundhra Bakhra, Advocates for
D-4 and D-5.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

%

16.10.2025

1. Mr. Jai Sahai Endlaw, counsel appearing on behalf of the plaintiff, has handed over an order passed by the Division Bench on 6th October, 2025 in FAO (OS) 114/2025 preferred by the defendants no.1 and 3 against the order passed by this Court on 16th September, 2025. The relevant extracts from the said order are set out below:

“2. *Learned counsels for the parties are ad idem that the application*



for grant of temporary injunction, filed under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 ("CPC"), is pending before the learned Single judge and is listed for consideration on 15.10.2025.

3. After arguing for some time, learned counsel for the parties have reached a consensus. It is agreed that the directions contained in paragraph 19 (ii) of the Impugned Order shall remain deleted/inoperative until the learned Single Judge decides the application under Order XXXIX Rules 1 & 2 of the CPC."

2. In view of the above, Mr. Endlaw presses for hearing of the present application today.

3. The Board of this Court does not permit to take up this application for hearing today.

4. Mr. Sandeep Sethi, Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the defendants no.4 and 5 submits that the two sale deeds executed in favour of the said defendants no.4 and 5 respectively, both dated 1st September, 2025, have not been released by the concerned Sub-Registrar stating that in view of the *status quo* order passed by this court on 16th September, 2025 the sale deeds are not being issued/delivered. In this regard, communications dated 29th September, 2025 and 1st October, 2025 have been handed over in Court. The same are taken on record.

4.1. Accordingly, he submits that necessary clarification of the said order dated 16th September, 2025 may be issued.

5. Mr. Endlaw opposes the request of the said clarification stating that no application for clarification has been filed on behalf of the said defendants.

6. In my view, there is no impediment in the Court clarifying its order even in the absence of an application for the same. Clearly, this Court did not intend to restrain the Sub-Registrar from releasing the registered sale deeds to the defendants no.4 and 5.



7. Accordingly, the order dated 16th September, 2025 is clarified to the limited extent that the said order did not restrain the Sub-Registrar from releasing the registered sale deeds in favour of the purchasers/ defendants no.4 and 5.
8. Once the original sale deeds have been released in favour of the defendants no.4 and 5, copies thereof shall be placed before this Court.
9. List on 10th November, 2025 in the '*Supplementary List*'.
10. Interim order to continue.
11. This order shall be given *dasti* under signatures of Court Master.

AMIT BANSAL, J

OCTOBER 16, 2025

Rzu