

Succession petition no.
161/2019.

Naseem Ahmad and
others.

vis
State NCT of Delhi
2025.

5/6/20

Pr. Gurspreet Singh Id. cl. for
the applicant (through V.C.).

At request adjourned.

Put up on 16/6/20 as prayed for;
for Fr.

(Rajinder Singh)
Vacation Judge
20/5/02
Central Delhi

①.

Succession
Petition.

no _____

Mohd. Zafar
V/S
State & Ors.

5/6/20

Pr. Sh. M.S. Khan Id. ce for
the petitioners.

Heard & pronounced.

Notice be issued to all the
respondents.

Mohd. Zafar is directed to
prepare the notices and
send the same on the email
address as provided in the
petition.

Contd.

(2)

Mhd. Farhan

V/S

State & O.S.

The petitioner is directed to get the notices served. In case of evasion or non-availability the respondents be served by way of affixation. The affixation be got photographed; the said photographs be filed along with service report and affidavit.

The notice be also got published in the news papers "Statesman".

Put up on 22/6/20 for F.P.

Rajh
(Rajinder Singh)
vacation Judge
ADJ/02
Central Delhi

C.S. no ¹~~345~~ 3695/19 &
3696/19.

Sandeep Kumar

vs

M/S Microsoft
Express Pvt. Ltd.

5/6/20

Pr. Sh. Vineet Gandhi Id. cl.
for Plaintiff / applicant.

The Plaintiff / applicant has
moved one each application
in both the Suits for preponement
/ early hearing of the applications
dt 5/3/20; these applications
dt 5/3/20 under Section 151
C.P.C. prayed for passing a
judgement / decree against the
defendant, as prayed by him
in the plaint. (sic).

¹
805/02
cmr.w.
5/6/20

Contd on 2

(2)

Other two applications in both the matters w/o XV A.C.P.C. were also moved.

at request both the applications w/o XV A.C.P.C. are adjourned for the date fixed in the main suit.

Hearings on the applications MS 151 CPC seeking postponement of the applications at 5/3/20.

It is submitted that the defendant has not paid rent since October 2019. Despite service the defendant did not file the written Statement. These are two separate tenancies with the same tenant. The applications at 5/3/20 have been adjourned for 10/8/20; which is a long date.

Contd on 3.

1
MS 102
contd
5/6/20

(3)

Further I d. cl. for the plaintiff/
applicant repeated the facts
already mentioned in the
applications.

Specific court query was
put to the I d. cl. for the plaintiff/
applicant as to what is the
urgency in the matter?

In response I d. cl.
repeated the aforementioned arguments/
submissions.

Reasons for order

In para no 7. of the application
it is stated that the plaintiff moved
an application u/s 151 C.P.C. for
striking off the defence of the
defendant due to non-filing of
the written statement.

2
1805/02
central
5/6/20

dated on 4

(4)

Notice of this application was issued to the defendant for 25/3/20.

However due to COVID-19/lockdown, on 25/3/20 the applications could not be heard. The same were adjourned for 10/8/20.

It is not the case of the plaintiff that the rent of the shops is his only source of income or that due to non-receipt of rent he is facing grave financial hardship.

The suit of the plaintiff is a normal routine suit for recovery of possession, arrears of rent and mesne profits. There is no element of urgency either in the original suit or these present applications.

Catered on 5.

AL
AOS/02
central
5/6/20.

(5)

There is nothing much to write about these applications. The plaintiff has failed to bring out any case of urgency in his favour.

The applications seeking pre payment are dismissed. No further order is required to be passed by this Court in these matters.

5/6/20.

Rajinder Singh
(Rajinder Singh)
Vacation Judge
ADJ/02
Central Delhi