



\$~2 to 6 & 8

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 401/2011**

AJAY MOHAN KAPUR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. R.P. Luthra and Mr. Pulkit
Luthra, Adv.

versus

POOJA KAPUR

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. R.D. Rana and Mr. Arvind
Sharma, Adv.

3

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1740/2009, CRL. M.A. 13610/2020, CRL. M.A.
4587/2012, CRL.M.A 18718/2016, CRL.M.A. 19128/2016,
CRL.M.A. 14478/2017 AND CRL. M.A. 47831/2018**

AJAY MOHAN KAPUR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. R.P. Luthra and Mr. Pulkit
Luthra, Adv.

versus

STATE N.C.T. OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Priyanka Dalal, APP for the State
with IO Ins. Ranbir Singh, PS Lajpat
Nagar.



4

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1189/2010**

AJAY MOHAN KAPOOR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. R.P. Luthra and Mr. Pulkit
Luthra, Advs.

versus

STATE & ANR

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari, Addl. Standing
Counsel with Mr. Sushant Bali and
Mr. Munal Mittal, for State.
Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari, Addl.
Standing Counsel for R-1 with Mr.
Adeeb-ul-Hasan, Adv. with IO Ins.
Ranbir Singh, PS Lajpat Nagar
Mr. R.D. Rana and Mr. Arvind
Sharma, Advs. For R-2.

5

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 609/2011**

POOJA KAPOOR @ RAKHI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. R.D. Rana and Mr. Arvind
Sharma, Advs.

versus

AJAY MOHAN KAPUR

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. R.P. Luthra and Mr. Pulkit
Luthra, Advs.

6

+ **CRL.M.C. 3689/2010**



RAKHI @ POOJA KAPUR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. R.D. Rana and Mr. Arvind
Sharma, Advs.

versus

STATE & ANR

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Priyanka Dalal, APP for the State
with IO Ins. Ranbir Singh, PS Lajpat
Nagar.

8

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1191/2010, CRL. M.A. 13677/2010 & CRL. M.A.
12415/2013**

AJAY MOHAN KAPOOR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. R.P. Luthra and Mr. Pulkit
Luthra, Advs.

versus

STATE & ANR

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP for the State
with IO SI Neelam, PS Rajouri
Garden.
Mr. R.D. Rana and Mr. Arvind
Sharma, Advs. For R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE POONAM A. BAMBA

%

ORDER
14.10.2022



- 1.0. Ld. Counsel for the respondent on instruction submits that though the petitioner had undertaken to deposit the school fees regularly, but had not done so.
- 2.0. Same is disputed by the ld. Counsel for the petitioner, who on instructions submits that he states at bar that school fee is being deposited regularly as and when demanded.
- 3.0. List on **07.02.2023**.
- 4.0. Interim order, if any, to continue till next date of hearing.

POONAM A. BAMBA, J

OCTOBER 14, 2022/chandan

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)