



\$~12

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CS(OS) 1456/2013 & I.A. 11638/2013, I.A. 8157/2014 I.A.
8666/2023, I.A. 18918/2023
RAJ PURI & ANRPlaintiffs

Through: Mr. Rajesh Rawal, Adv.
versus

VINOD PURI & ANRDefendants

Through: Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, Mr. Kunal
Sachdeva and Mr. Lakshay Yadav,
Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **22.04.2026**

I.A. 3961/2025 (by D-1 for directions under Section 151 CPC)

1. In the present application, following relief has been sought:

- (a) Direct evidence of PW-1 (Mr. Chetan Kumar Puri- Plaintiff No.2) in the present case to be recorded before this Hon'ble Court or court of learned Joint Registrar and other witnesses can be relegated to the Id. Local Commissioner;*
- (b) Direct PW-1 (Mr. Chetan Kumar Puri- Plaintiff No.2) to maintain decorum and not restrict counsel for defendant no.1 to ask questions only with regard to 'Prayer' clause of present suit;*
- (c) Direct PW-1 (Mr. Chetan Kumar Puri- Plaintiff No.2) to participate in the cross examination of present case by answering the questions put to him;*

2. Mr. Rajesh Rawal, learned counsel for the plaintiffs submit that PW-1 i.e plaintiff no.2/Mr. Chetan Kumar Puri is a permanent resident of Portugal. He submits that he has tendered himself for cross-examination on as many as 03 occasions and the cross-examination has not yet been concluded by defendant no.1.



3. He submits that during such cross-examination, as many as 295 questions have been put by defendant no.1 to PW-1. He submits that the present suit is a suit for possession under Section 6 of the Specific Relief Act, 1963 and defendant no.1 is unnecessarily dragging the suit by prolonging the cross-examination.

4. He further submits that reply to the present application has been filed articulating his defence to the present application, however, the same is lying under objection. The Registry is directed to place the reply on record.

5. On instructions, he submits that since PW-1 is a resident of Portugal and he is not in a position to come again for his cross-examination. He submits that the cross-examination of PW-1 be closed.

6. As prayed by Mr. Rawal, further cross-examination of PW-1 is closed. The evidentiary value of the statement of PW-1 will be considered at the time of final hearing.

7. Accordingly, the application has been rendered infructuous and is disposed of as such.

CS(OS) 1456/2013

8. List before the learned Local Commissioner for recording of evidence of PW-2, on a date to be fixed by him.

9. Let parties approach the learned Local Commissioner for fixing a date for recording of evidence of PW-2.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

APRIL 22, 2026/dss