



\$~38

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **FAO 266/2025, CM APPL. 60869/2025, CM APPL. 60870/2025 and**
CM APPL. 60871/2025

BSES YAMUNA POWER LIMITEDAppellant
Through: Mr.Manish Srivastava, Mr.Moksh Arora
and Mr.Santosh Ramdurg, Advocates
versus

RANI GAUTAMRespondent
Through: Mr.Chirag Madan, Mr.Sai Krishna
Kumar, Mr.Ronit Bose, Ms.Rachael Tuli and
Mr.Kaustabh Seth, Advocates

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER
28.03.2026

%

Since 02.03.2026 was declared holiday vide notification dated 27.02.2026, the matters fixed on 02.03.2026 were directed to be taken up on 28.03.2026.

CM APPL. 60870/2025 & CM APPL. 60871/2025

1. By way of the present applications, the applicant/appellant seeks condonation of delay of 30 days in filing and 76 days in re-filing the present appeal.
2. For or the reasons stated in the applications, the delay of 30 days in filing and 76 days in re-filing the appeal is condoned.
3. The application are disposed of accordingly.

FAO 266/2025 & CM APPL. 60869/2025

1. The present appeal has been preferred seeking to assail the orders dated 29.10.2024 and 24.02.2025 passed by the learned Civil Judge-01, Central District, *Tis Hazari* Courts, Delhi in CS SCJ No.1678/2024 titled as



‘RANI GAUTAM v. BSES YAMUNA POWER LTD.’.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that, *vide* the impugned order dated 29.10.2024, the Trial Court allowed the application filed by the plaintiff/respondent under Order XXXIX Rules 1 & 2 CPC. It is contended that, while passing the said order, the Trial Court failed to take into account the contentions of the appellant, in this regard, specific mention is made to Central Electricity Authority (Measures relating to Safety and Electric Supply) Regulations, 2010. He further submits that a review application was thereafter filed along with an application seeking condonation of delay of 34 days under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, and the delay was explained, however, the same came to be dismissed solely on the ground of limitation. It is further submitted that the appellant had initially made efforts to comply with the impugned order; however, in view of the aforesaid Regulations, it became necessary to file the review application. It is contended that the said Regulations have a direct bearing on the adjudication of the application filed by the plaintiff under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 CPC.

3. Without going into the merits of the submissions, it is deemed apposite that the delay in filing the review application be condoned and the review application be considered on merits by the learned Trial Court for which purpose, let the matter be listed at the first instance on 13.04.2026.

4. In view of the above, the present appeal is disposed of alongwith the pending application.

DASTI

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

MARCH 28, 2026/na