### VERSATILE BONDS PRIVATE LTD Vs. AGGARWAL FOOTWEAR Through Cisco Webex Video Conferencing

Through Cisco Webex Video Conferencing

06.08.2020

Since the matter was adjourned en-bloc due to pandemic covid-19 situation, therefore, the ordersheet during the lock down period is not on record.

Pr: None for plaintiff.

Ms.Akshita Chattwal, Ld.proxy counsel for defendant.

In compliance of circular/duty roaster for August, 2020 (Period 04.08.2020 to 14.08.2020) dated 31.07.2020 of Ld.District & Sessions Judge, West, THC, Delhi, the present case being listed for evidence is adjourned for 26.11.2020 for purpose already fixed.

I.A. No.1/2020 CS No. 12822/16 Bhim Sain Jain Vs. Dalip Kumar Jain

Through Cisco Webex Video Conferencing 06.08.2020 (10.40 a.m. to 10.42 a.m.)

Pr: Sh.S.C.Singhal, Ld.counsel for applicant /plaintiff.

(Mobile No: 9810061558)

(Email ID: scsinghal@rediffmail.com).

Notice sent to defendant not received back from Nazarat Branch, West, THC, Delhi. Be awaited.

In the meanwhile, issue fresh notice of the applications to defendant through Nazarat Branch, West, THC, Delhi subject to applicant/plaintiff providing his email ID/whatsapp number for 19.08.2020.

### Civ DJ 13594/16 PATEL WOOD PRODUCTS LTD. Vs. ERA INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING LTD.

### **Through Cisco Webex Video Conferencing**

06.08.2020

Since the matter was adjourned en-bloc due to pandemic covid-19 situation, therefore, the ordersheet during the lock down period is not on record.

Pr: None for plaintiff.

Sh.Nikhil Sharma, Ld.counsel for defendant.

In compliance of circular/duty roaster for August, 2020 (Period 04.08.2020 to 14.08.2020) dated 31.07.2020, of Ld.District & Sessions Judge, West, THC, Delhi, the present case being listed for evidence is adjourned for 26.11.2020 for purpose already fixed.

### Ex.No.60949/16 Smt.Santosh Vs. Sh.Amarjeet Singh

06.08.2020

Since the matter was adjourned en-bloc due to pandemic covid-19 situation, therefore, the ordersheet during the lock down period is not on record.

Pr: None.

Till 12.20 p.m. none of the parties appeared through video conferencing.

In the facts, put up on 09.10.2020 for purpose already fixed.

### Civ DJ 650/17 RAJAN MASIH Vs. CHOTEY LAL AND ORS.

06.08.2020

Since the matter was adjourned en-bloc due to pandemic covid-19 situation, therefore, the ordersheet during the lock down period is not on record.

Pr: None.

In compliance of circular/duty roaster for August, 2020 (Period 04.08.2020 to 14.08.2020) dated 31.07.2020 of Ld.District & Sessions Judge, West, THC, Delhi, the present case being listed for evidence is adjourned for 26.11.2020 for purpose already fixed.

## EX No. 60944/17 Madan Mohan Sharma Vs. Avtar Singh

06.08.2020

Since the matter was adjourned en-bloc due to pandemic covid-19 situation, therefore, the ordersheet during the lock down period is not on record.

Pr: None.

Till 12.20 p.m. none of the parties appeared through video conferencing.

In the facts, put up on 09.10.2020 for purpose already fixed.

06.08.2020

Since the matter was adjourned en-bloc due to pandemic covid-19 situation, therefore, the ordersheet during the lock down period is not on record.

Pr: None.

Till 12.20 p.m. none of the parties appeared through video conferencing.

In the facts, put up on 07.10.2020 for purpose already fixed.

M No. 172/17 Santosh Vs. Amarjeet Singh

06.08.2020

Since the matter was adjourned en-bloc due to pandemic covid-19 situation, therefore, the ordersheet during the lock down period is not on record.

Pr: None.

Till 12.20 p.m. none of the parties appeared through video conferencing.

In the facts, put up on 09.10.2020 for purpose already fixed.

### Civ DJ 651/17 RAJAN MASIH Vs. RAJENDER MASIH

06.08.2020

Since the matter was adjourned en-bloc due to pandemic covid-19 situation, therefore, the ordersheet during the lock down period is not on record.

Pr: None.

In the present case, an application under order XXXIX Rule 2(A) read with Section 151 CPC and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 was filed on 26.02.2020.

In compliance of circular/duty roaster for August, 2020 (Period 04.08.2020 to 14.08.2020) dated 31.07.2020 of Ld.District & Sessions Judge, West, THC, Delhi, the present case being listed for evidence is adjourned for 26.11.2020 for purpose already fixed.

# CS No. 259/2020 Smt.Manju Aggarwal Vs. Smt.Shashi Jasoria

# Through Cisco Webex Video Conferencing

06.08.2020 (12.12 p.m. to 12.14 p.m.)

Pr: Sh.Dev Raj Aggarwal, Ld.counsel for plaintiff.

(Mobile No.: 011-23935650 / 9810081751)

(Email ID: devrajgadvocate@gmail.com)

As per report of ahlmad, process not received back from Nazarat Branch, West, THC, Delhi. Be awaited.

In the meanwhile, issue fresh summons of the suit and notice of the application under Order XXXIX Rule 1 and 2 CPC to defendant through Nazarat Branch, West, THC, Delhi subject to plaintiff providing email ID /Whatsapp number of the defendant for 23.09.2020.

# Kanwar Singh Tanwar Vs. Davender Kumar and Ors. Through Cisco Webex Video Conferencing

06.08.2020 (10.45 a.m. to 11.00 a.m. and from 11.41 a.m. to 11.43 a.m.)

Pr: Sh.Achal Gupta, Ld.counsel for the Decree Holder.

(Mobile No.: 9891191186)

(Email Id: achalg@aeqlaw.com)

Sh.D.Hasija, Ld.counsel for judgment debtors no.3 and 4.

(Mobile No.: 9818815643 and 9810064629)

(Email ID: hasija@ymail.com)

Sh.Balram Sharma, Naib Nazir is also present.

(Mobile No. 9818170426)

(Email ID. naziradj05@gmail.com)

On inquiry from Id.counsel for DH, he has submitted that he has filed on record certified copy of sale deed.

The Naib Nazir of this court has, on inquiry, confirmed this fact and even a copy of registered sale deed has been received by the undersigned on his email. Same perused.

Today, Ld.counsel for JDs no.3 and 4 has filed on record an application furnishing particulars of bank

account of JDs no.3 and 4 for release of amount deposited by the decree holder. Same taken on record.

Now, in compliance of order of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi dated 15.04.2019, issue directions to the Manager, Oriental Bank of Commerce, Branch Kirti Nagar, Delhi to encash the FDR having Term Deposit Receipt bearing no. 6315486 and release the principal amount of Rs.67,63,580/- in favour of JDs no.3 Smt.Kiran Tanwar and JD No.4 Sh.Dinesh Kumar by transferring the amount through NEFT/RTGS in their ioint account 10031000003956, IFSC HDFC0001003 in HDFC Bank Ltd., Branch Bali Nagar, New Delhi in equal proportions and the interest part be transferred into the account of DH through NEFT/RTGS. The details of account of DH Kanwar Singh Tanwar are as follows:-

A/C No. 00222010002430, IFSC Code: ORBC0100022, Oriental Bank of Commerce, Kirti Nagar Branch, New Delhi.

A copy of FDR alongwith a copy of order be given dasti to DH and/or his counsel, who shall personally serve the same upon the Bank Manager, Oriental Bank of Commerce, Branch Kirti Nagar,

Delhi for compliance.

Put up on 31.08.2020 for arguments on the pending application of DH.

I.A. No. 1/2020 in Execution No. 140/17 M/s.Satya Prakash and Bros. Pvt.Ltd. Vs. Union of India

# **Through Cisco Webex Video Conferencing**

06.08.2020 (11.02 a.m. to 11.12 a.m. and from 12.09 p.m. to 12.11 p.m.)

Pr: Ms.Anusuya Salwan, Ld.counsel for applicant/DH.

(Mobile No.9811225368 and 9999897128) (Email ID: anu11salwan@yahoo.co.in)

JD absent.

Report regarding notice sent to JD received back from the Nazarat Branch, West, Delhi on whatsapp number of Naib Nazir and as per the same, notice has been duly served upon JD and Id.counsel for JD.

Ld.counsel for DH has submitted that she has also sent notice to JD as well as their counsel on their email and same has been duly served. Compliance report by DH has also been received on court email ID and reader of the court has put the same before the undersigned through email.

It is further submitted by Id.counsel for DH that she had a telephonic conversation with the Ld.counsel

for JD but he has submitted that he will not be able to appear.

From the submissions made by Ld.counsel for DH and the report filed on record, I am satisfied that JD has been duly served with the notice of the application. But despite service, they have chosen not to appear. Therefore, they have no opposition to the application filed by DH. Hence, the application filed by DH is allowed. The same stands disposed of, accordingly.

Now, issue notice to the Manager, State Bank of India, Branch Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi to attach the account no. 30357419499 of JD as mentioned in para 11 of the execution petition to the tune of decreetal amount of Rs. 11,74,914/-and remit the amount to this court by the next date of hearing i.e. 28.08.2020.

A copy of order passed today be given dasti to DH and/or his counsel, who shall personally serve the same upon the bank manager for compliance.

(Vikas Dhull) ADJ-01,

West, THC,

Delhi

### Misc.DJ 160/2020 Harjinder Singh Vs. Narender Kumar Jain

## Through Cisco Webex Video Conferencing

06.08.2020 (12.15 p.m. to 12.17 p.m.)

Pr: Sh.Alamine, Ld.counsel for applicant. (Mobile No: 8826112034).

Arguments on the application of applicant seeking waiving of cost imposed vide order dated 11.07.2019 heard today.

LY THE RICH COST, ACCOUNT TO USE THE DESIGNATION OF

Put up today at 4.00 p.m. for orders.

(Vikas Dhull) ADJ-01,

West,THC,

Delhi

# IN THE COURT OF VIKAS DHULL: ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE-01, WEST, THC, DELHI

Misc.DJ 160/2020 Harjinder Singh Vs. Narender Kumar Jain

Date of filing of application: 20.03.2020

Date on which application was registered:

04.04.2020

Date on which order reserved: 06.08.2020 Date on which order passed: 06.08.2020

#### **ORDER**

- Vide this order, I shall dispose of the application of applicant seeking waiving of cost imposed vide order dated 11.07.2019.
- Ld.counsel for applicant has submitted that applicant is a poor person and is unable to pay such a huge cost. Accordingly, he has prayed for waiving of cost imposed vide order dated 11.07.2019.
- 3. I have carefully perused the order dated 11.07.2019 and order itself is a self explanatory as to why such a huge cost was imposed upon the applicant as he was in the habit of filing frivolous applications. Therefore, no ground made out for waiving of cost. The application is devoid of any merits. The same is accordingly, dismissed.

4. Application stands disposed of.

(Vikas Dhull) ADJ-01,

West, THC,

Delhi

Misc.DJ 160/2020 Harjinder Singh Vs. Narender Kumar Jain

06.08.2020 (4.00 p.m.)

Pr: None.

Vide separate order passed today, the application of applicant seeking waiving of cost imposed vide order dated 11.07.2019 is dismissed.

Application be consigned to record room.