



\$~6

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CS(OS) 22/2025**

SH. RAM KUMAR CHIKARAPlaintiff

Through: Ms. Urinda Bhandari, DHCLSC with
Ms. Nitya Jain, Advocates.

versus

SH. HARIGYAN & ORS.Defendants

Through: Mr. Randhir Kumar, Advocate for
D-2,3,4,5 & 6.

CORAM:
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL) SH. SUMIT DALAL

% **ORDER**
21.05.2026

1. As per service report, Defendant No. 1 could not be served.
2. It is stated in the service report that the process server met a lady who informed that she is the sister-in-law of Defendant No. 1 and that Defendant No. 1 has already expired.
3. As regards Defendant Nos. 2 to 7, attention of the Court is invited to order dated 30.10.2025 wherein vide para 2 thereof, it had been recorded that Defendant Nos. 2 to 6 had already been served.
4. It is further recorded in para 3 of the said order that the service report qua Defendant No. 7 had been received back with the report “refused by son” and in view thereof, learned predecessor had deemed Defendant No. 7 to be served.
5. Accordingly, even if 30.10.2025 is taken as the date of service



upon Defendant Nos. 2 to 7, the extendable period of 120 days for filing written statement has already expired.

6. In view of Chapter VII Rule 4 of the Delhi High Court (Original Side) Rules, 2018, the right of Defendant Nos. 2 to 7 to file written statement is hereby closed.
7. Let appropriate steps, in accordance with Rules, be taken qua Defendant No. 1, who has been reported to have expired.
8. List for further proceedings on 25.09.2026.

SUMIT DALAL
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDICIAL)

MAY 21, 2026/LP