



\$~O-52

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ TEST.CAS. 38/2014 & I.A. 34367/2024, I.A. 4342/2025

HARKIRAT SINGH SODHI

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Neelima Tripathi, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Lalit Gupta, Mr. Priyansh Jain
and Mr. Kritik Verma, Advocates.

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ved Prakash Sharma and Ms.
Amrit Kaur Oberoi and Mr. Manish
Saryal, Advs. for R-2 to 4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **29.07.2025**

**I.A. 34367/2024 (filed on behalf of applicant Mr. Harkirat Singh Sodhi,
to get the colored photocopy of the revocation deed dated 05.06.2004)**

1. Heard learned counsel appearing for the parties.
2. There seem to be two essential prayers in the instant application. With respect to prayer A, Mr. Lalit Gupta, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that in the *interregnum*, the said prayer has rendered infructuous.
3. So far as prayer B is concerned, Mr. Ved Prakash Sharma, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.2 to 4, contends that a coloured photocopy of the alleged Will dated 07.09.2004 is already in possession of



the applicant, much before the same was placed in a sealed cover. He, however, submits that he does not have any objections in even supplying another coloured photocopy of the said Will to the petitioner.

4. In view of the aforesaid, the Court finds that without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the parties, a coloured photocopy of the Will dated 07.09.2004 can be directed to be supplied to the applicant by the concerned Joint Registrar.

5. Ordered accordingly.

6. Let the steps be taken by the concerned Joint Registrar for compliance of this order.

7. Application stands disposed of.

I.A. 9817/2025 (filed on behalf of respondent No.1 seeking direction to expedite day to day and time bound completion of cross examination of RW2)

1. Heard learned counsel appearing for the parties.

2. Various submissions have been made by Ms. Neelima Tripathi, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr. Ved Prakash Sharma, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.2 to 4.

3. Mr. Sharma submits that, looking at the nature of the controversy and the protracted period of pendency, it would be appropriate to direct for a day-to-day recording of the evidence of the witnesses.

4. Ms. Tripathi, learned senior counsel, on the other hand, contends that the day-to-day recording of the evidence, under the facts and circumstances of the case, is not feasible. According to her, the matter is being expedited by the concerned Joint Registrar, and at least four dates have been given in the month of July itself.



5. Having heard learned counsel appearing for the parties, the Court finds that at this stage, there would not be any justification to accept the prayer A in its entirety. However, the evidence of RW2 is directed to be expedited and recorded as early as possible.

6. With respect to the recording of the evidence of the remaining witnesses, Mr. Sharma, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.2 to 4 is granted liberty to move an application for the appointment of the Local Commissioner. If the steps are taken, the Court shall consider them appropriately.

7. Accordingly, the application stands disposed of.

I.A 17999/2025 (filed on behalf of the petitioner for placing on record the conduct of respondent No.2)

1. Heard Ms. Tripathi, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner.

2. Notice.

3. Learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.2 to 4 accepts notice. Let him to take instructions and to file a reply.

4. List this application on 09.10.2025.

5. Let the affidavit of Ved Prakash Malhorta be also filed with a response to recitals made in the instant application.

TEST.CAS. 38/2014 & I.A. 34367/2024, I.A. 4342/2025

List before the concerned Joint Registrar on 20.08.2025.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

JULY 29, 2025/P/MJ