



\$~17

*

+

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

CS(OS) 96/2018

MR. SANJIT CHATTERJEE

.....Plaintiff

Through: Ms. Madhurima Ghosh, Adv.
(appeared through VC)

versus

ALOK K. BAGCHI & ORS

.....Defendant

Through: None.

CORAM:

JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL) SH. SUMIT

DALAL

ORDER

19.05.2026

%

I.A.No.12057/2018 (under Section 151 CPC filed on behalf of the plaintiff for issuance of directions to defendant no.1 for restoring the damaged portion of the suit property)

1. Perusal of order dated 18.09.2025 reveals that pleadings stand completed.
2. By way of the present application, the plaintiff seeks issuance of directions to Defendant No. 1 for restoration of the damaged portion of the suit property.
3. When queried by the Court as to why the application is not being pressed for arguments, learned counsel for the plaintiff prays for an adjournment for today and undertakes to clarify the same on the next date of hearing.
4. Request allowed.

I.A.No.2258/2019 (under Order VI Rule 17 CPC filed on behalf of the plaintiff for amendment of plaint)

5. By way of the present application, amendment of the plaint is being sought.



6. The said application has also been pending since the year 2019.
7. When a similar query was raised to learned counsel for the plaintiff regarding arguments and adjudication of the captioned IA, time is sought.
8. Allowed.

I.A.No.1334/2020 (under Section 151 CPC filed on behalf of plaintiff to restrain defendant no.1 from carrying out illegal construction)

9. Order dated 18.09.2025 records that learned counsel for Defendant No. 1 had submitted that notice of the captioned IA had not been issued.
10. When clarification was sought from learned counsel for the plaintiff as to why notice has not been issued in the captioned IA till date despite the same having been filed in the year 2020, she prays for an adjournment and undertakes to clarify the same on the next date of hearing.
11. None appears on behalf of Defendant No. 1 today and therefore, clarification could not be sought from the said side as well.
12. Let the issue be clarified on the next date of hearing.

CS(OS) 96/2018

13. On 18.09.2025, learned counsel for the plaintiff had submitted before the Court that Smt. Shukla Bagchi had expired.
14. Learned counsel for the plaintiff submits that an application seeking impleadment of LRs of late Smt. Shukla Bagchi has already been filed.
15. However, neither the case record nor the office note



reflects the same.

16. Accordingly, the plaintiff is directed to coordinate with the Registry and have the said application placed on record.

17. List for further proceedings on **24.09.2026**.

SUMIT DALAL
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL)

MAY 19, 2026/nk