



\$~12

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CS(OS) 741/2025**
MR SYED AZIZ UR RAHMAN

.....Plaintiff

Through: Appearance not given.

versus

MRS JASMINE SAINI AND ORS

.....Defendant

Through: Mr. Syamantak Sen, Advocate for D-1 to 3.
Md. Irshad Hanif & Md. Irshad Hanif, Advocates for D-8 and 9, (Mobile no. 09810041811)
Mr. Danish Sher Khan, Advocate for D-5.
Mr. Irshad Hanif, Advocate for D- 8 & 9, (Mobile no. 09810041811)

CORAM:
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL) SH. SUMIT DALAL, (DHJS)

ORDER
19.03.2026

%

IA No. 27842/2025:

1. No reply has been filed till date. Perusal of the order dated 06.11.2025 reveals that notice was accepted by the plaintiff and four weeks' time was granted to file reply. Thereafter, in the interest of justice, a further two weeks' time was granted vide order dated 20.02.2026.
2. None appears on behalf of the plaintiff at this stage. Passover is not



possible considering the heavy board.

3. In view of the submissions made by learned counsel for the applicant (Defendant Nos. 1 to 3) and considering the conduct of the plaintiff, this Court is of the view that sufficient opportunity has already been granted. Accordingly, the right of the plaintiff to file reply to the captioned IA is closed.

IA No. 1744/2026

4. As per office note, no reply has been filed till date.

CS(OS) 741/2025

5. As per office note, documents including copy of bank statement for the period 01.02.2026 to 28.02.2026 have been filed on behalf of Defendant Nos. 1 to 3 in compliance of order dated 09.12.2025.
6. As per office note, the filing on behalf of Defendant No. 5 has been returned under objections. Defendant No. 5 is directed to coordinate with the Registry and have the objections removed.
7. As per office note, vakalatnama has been filed on behalf of Defendant Nos. 8 and 9, which is taken on record.
8. Vide order dated 20.02.2026, directions were issued for fresh summons to unserved defendants. However, as per office note, summons could not be issued due to failure on the part of the plaintiff to file process fee. Accordingly, a cost of ₹5,000/- is imposed on the plaintiff, to be deposited with the Delhi High Court Bar Association. One further opportunity is granted. Let steps be taken within one week from today.
9. At this stage, when the dictation of the present order was almost



complete, learned counsel for the plaintiff appeared through VC and sought two days' time to file reply to IA No. 27842/2025, despite the fact that the right to file the same has already been closed by today's order. The said request is strongly opposed by learned counsel for Defendant Nos. 1 to 3, submitting that sufficient opportunity has already been granted and any further indulgence would prejudice the proceedings, particularly in view of the next date before the Hon'ble Court i.e., 23.03.2026.

10.No satisfactory explanation has been furnished for not filing the reply despite lapse of substantial time of about four months. Accordingly, the request is declined.

11.The matter is listed before the Hon'ble Court on 23.03.2026.

12.Let the matter be listed on the said date for further directions.

SUMIT DALAL, (DHJS)
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL)

MARCH 19, 2026/da