



\$~47

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ CRL.M.C. 8900/2025, CRL.M.A. 37118-37120/2025

**TULSIANI CONSTRUSCTIONS AND DEVELOPERS LTD AND
ORS**Petitioners

Through: Mr. A. Mishra, Mr. Sahil and
Mr. Nidish Gupta, Advocates.

versus

SWATI GOELRespondent

Through: Mr. Seshagiri Vadlamani and
Mr. Ananya Kukreti, Advocates.

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA**

**ORDER
12.12.2025**

%

1. The Petitioner challenges the summoning order dated 31st October, 2018 in CT Case No. 5113/2018 on the technical ground that the legal notice preceding the complaint demanded an amount higher than the dishonoured cheque amounts. At the outset, it is observed that there is an unexplained and substantial delay in filing the present petition despite repeated queries from the Court.
2. The Court has further enquired whether the allegedly defective demand notice was ever served on the Petitioner. Counsel for the Petitioner candidly admits that it was not served. The Court accordingly queried what prejudice is said to have arisen so as to attract proviso (b) to Section 138 of the NI Act.



3. On this aspect, counsel for the Respondent submits that he would also like to cite certain rulings.
4. Lis ton 12th January, 2026.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

DECEMBER 12, 2025

nk