



§~

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

Reserved on: 27th May, 2025
Date of Decision: 26th August, 2025

+ CS(OS) 1/2022, I.A. 3/2022, I.A. 10238/2023 & I.A. 11687/2023

LT COL DR YASMIN YUSUFZAI RETDPlaintiff

Through: Mr. Abhishek Singh, Mr. J. Anal
Anand, Mr. Vaibhav Vutts and Ms.
Aamna Hassan, Advs with Plaintiff in
person

versus

MR AWES RAJPUT & ORS.Defendants

Through: None for D-1
Mr. Akshat Gupta and Mr. Abdhesh
Chaudhary, Advs. for D-2with D-2 in
person
Mr. Tushar Sannu and Mr. Sourav
Verma, Adv. for GNCTD
Mr. Kuljeet Rawal, Adv. for D-3 and 4
with Mr. Jagjit Singh, son of D-3 & D-
4

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

%

J U D G M E N T

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J:

1. The present suit has been filed for declaration, permanent injunction, mandatory injunction, recovery of possession and cancellation of the



following illegal sale deeds (i) Sale Deed dated 09.07.2020¹; (ii) followed by Sale Deed dated 29.07.2020², both with respect to the Ground Floor consisting of three (3) bedroom with attached bathroom, one Drawing-cum-Dining, Lobby, one (1) Kitchen, Front and Rear Balconies along with one (1) Servant Quarter on the top terrace with common W.C. and two (2) car parking rights in the stilt area with exclusive independent gate (adjoining to Property No. S-396), along with proportionate, undivided, indivisible and impartible ownership rights in the freehold land measuring 204 sq. yds. bearing No. S-398, situated at Greater Kailash – I, New Delhi -110048 ('Ground Floor Portion'); and (iii) Sale Deed dated 29.07.2020³ with respect to rear side stilt area measuring approx. 900 sq. ft. with entrance from front and rear side, along with proportionate undivided, indivisible and impartible ownership rights in the freehold land underneath measuring 204 sq. yds., bearing No. S-398, situated at Greater Kailash, Part-I, New Delhi-110048 ('Rear Stilt Area').

Brief Facts

2. The case of the Plaintiff is that she is admittedly the absolute owner of the Ground Floor and Rear Stilt Area (together forming the 'Suit Property'), having purchased the same for a sale consideration of Rs. 1.77 Crores in 2013 from one Mr. Gurmit Ram Nafri vide registered sale deed dated 18.12.2013. It is stated that the said original sale deed dated 18.12.2013 is in possession of Plaintiff and it matches with the original of the said sale deed dated 18.12.2013 available in records of the Defendant No.5⁴.

¹ Executed by Lady impersonating as Plaintiff, in favour of Defendant No. 2.

² Executed by Defendant No. 2, in favour of Defendant No. 3 and Defendant No. 4.

³ Executed by Lady impersonating as Plaintiff in favour of Defendant No. 3 and Defendant No. 4.

⁴ Sub-Registrar-VA-Hauz Khas.



2.1. It is stated that in July, 2014, sister-in-law of the Plaintiff introduced her to Defendant No.1, who requested the Plaintiff to induct Defendant No.1 as a tenant in the Suit Property. It is stated that the Plaintiff agreed to induct the Defendant No.1 as tenant in the Suit Property for a monthly rent of Rs. 80,000/-, on request of the Defendant No.1. It is stated that Defendant No.1 insisted on not executing any written Lease Deed and to show his bonafide Defendant No.1 paid the entire annual rent in advance. It is stated that the oral tenancy started from mid-July, 2014 and was extended on various occasions till 31.12.2016. The rental up to 31.12.2016 stood paid by the Defendant No.1.

2.2. It is stated that after 31.12.2016 the Plaintiff insisted on registration of a Lease Deed and accordingly a Lease Deed was executed on 06.01.2017 for a period of 11 months till 05.12.2017 and the Defendant No. 1 defaulted in payment of rent w.e.f. January 2017. It is stated that thereafter, the Defendant No.1 in August, 2018 agreed to vacate the Suit Property; he however, executed a Lease Deed dated 24.08.2018 for regularizing the tenancy period from 05.12.2017 till 30.09.2018 and agreed to clear the current and outstanding amount due towards the monthly rental.

2.3. It is stated that however, the Defendant No.1 defaulted in vacating the Suit Property as well as in making payment of the outstanding monthly rentals. It is stated that on 01.10.2018 the Defendant No.1 categorically refused to vacate the Suit Property.

2.4. It is stated that Plaintiff later got to know that the Defendant No.1 had registered a company named M/s Toco Exim Limited at the address of the Suit Property.



2.5. It is stated that the Plaintiff issued a Legal Notice on 29.01.2019 calling upon Defendant No.1 to vacate the Suit Property, which was not replied to by the Defendant No.1. It is stated that thereafter, the Plaintiff on 11.03.2019 filed a suit for possession, recovery of rent, damages, mesne profit and permanent injunction before Saket Court ('Trial Court'), numbered as CS No. 219/2019. It is stated that after issuance of summons in the said suit on 12.03.2019, the Defendant No.1 on 22.03.2019 replied to the legal notice dated 29.01.2019 raising a defence that Plaintiff entered into an alleged oral Agreement to Sell ('ATS') with Defendant No.1 on 28.12.2016 with respect to transfer of the Suit Property in the name of Defendant No.1.

2.6. It is stated that on 04.05.2019 the Trial Court passed *status quo* order against the Defendant No.1, restraining the Defendant No.1 from creating any third-party interest in the Suit Property. It is stated that Defendant No.1 filed his written statement and also filed Counter-Claim which was numbered as CS No. 494/2019, in which he admitted the ownership of the Plaintiff. It is stated that relying on the said admission of the Defendant No.1, the Plaintiff filed an application under Order XII Rule 6 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 ('CPC'), which was allowed by the Trial Court vide order dated 17.07.2020. It is stated that subsequent thereto, a decree for possession was also prepared of the like date. It is stated that thereafter, the Plaintiff filed Execution Petition No. 107/2021 for execution of the order dated 17.07.2020, which is pending adjudication.

2.7. It is stated that in March, 2021 the Plaintiff visited the Suit Property and found that there is name plate of Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 showing them as the owners of the Suit Property. It is stated that on enquiry the Plaintiff



found about two (2) illegal sale deeds executed by Defendants in connivance with each other, the description of said illegal sale deeds reads as under:

S.NO.	Date of Sale Deed	Executed By and For	Executed in Favour of	Witness
Illegal Sale Deed No.1	09.07.2020	Lady impersonating as Plaintiff, for Ground Floor	Defendant No.2	Defendant No.1
Illegal Sale Deed No.2	29.07.2020	Defendant No.2, for Ground Floor	Defendant No.3 and Defendant No.4	Lady impersonating as Plaintiff

2.8. It is stated that in addition to the fact that sale deed dated 09.07.2020 is illegal and void it is a matter of record that there was restraint order dated 04.05.2019 and decree of possession dated 17.07.2020 in operation and therefore, intent of Defendant No. 1 to overreach the said judicial orders is writ large.

2.9. It is stated that in these facts, the Plaintiff filed the present suit and the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 filed their written statement in the present suit on 22.03.2022 and also served upon the Plaintiff, list of documents relied upon by them. It is stated after perusal of the said written statement and list of documents the Plaintiff came across a third illegal sale deed, the description of the said sale deed reads as under:

S.NO.	Date of Sale Deed	Executed By and For	Executed in Favour of	Witness
--------------	--------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------	----------------



Illegal Sale Deed No.3	29.07.2020	Lady impersonating as Plaintiff, for Rear Stilt Area	Defendant Nos. 3 and 4	Defendant No.1
-------------------------------	------------	--	------------------------	----------------

2.10. It is stated that along with the written statement, Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 also produced and relied upon copy of sale deed dated 18.12.2013 which was *ex-facie* forged and did not match with the records of Defendant No. 5.

2.11. It is stated that as per the disclosures made in the written statement of Defendant Nos. 3 and 4, the Plaintiff filed an application i.e., I.A. No.21766/2022 under Order VI Rule 17 CPC for amendment of the plaint to include challenge to aforesaid sale deeds dated 29.07.2020 and 18.12.2013 (produced by the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4), which was allowed by this Court vide the order dated 29.01.2024 and the amended plaint was taken on record.

2.12. As per the amended plaint it is stated that the copy of sale deed dated 18.12.2013 filed by the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 is not the true and correct copy of the original of the said sale deed dated 18.12.2013 which is in possession of the Plaintiff and available in the records of Defendant No.5.

2.13. It is stated that it clearly emerges from the record that, all the three (3) illegal sale deeds were executed at the behest of Defendant No.1 because of the following reasons: (i) Defendant No.1 got a Lady to impersonate as Plaintiff; (ii) Misrepresented the Plaintiff as his wife in all the three (3) illegal sale deeds; (iii) Opened a joint bank account with Lady impersonating as Plaintiff, in AU Small Finance Bank just a month before execution of the illegal sale deeds, in which account the sale consideration under the illegal



sale deeds was received; (iv) Got the illegal sale deeds executed in utter defiance of the *status quo* order dated 04.05.2019 passed by the Trial Court; and (v) Delivered the possession of the Suit Property to the Defendant Nos. 2, 3 and 4 in contravention of the decree of possession in favour of the Plaintiff dated 17.07.2020.

2.14. In the aforementioned facts, the Plaintiff seeks cancellation of the illegal sale deeds dated 09.07.2020, 29.07.2020 and 29.07.2020. Further the Plaintiff has also sought relief of declaration qua sale deed dated 18.12.2013 produced by Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 to the effect that Plaintiff is the sole and exclusive owner of the Suit Property.

Arguments on behalf of the Plaintiff

3. Mr. Abhishek Singh, learned counsel for the Plaintiff stated that the District Magistrate (South) as directed by this Court vide order dated 29.04.2024 conducted an inquiry and submitted its inquiry report confirming the sale deed dated 18.12.2013 in possession of the Plaintiff as the genuine sale deed which matches with the sale deed dated 18.12.2013 present in records of the Defendant No.5. He stated that the said inquiry also revealed that the sale deed dated 18.12.2013 relied upon by the Defendant Nos. 2 to 4 does not exist in the records of the Defendant No.5.

3.1. He stated that this Court vide order dated 06.02.2025 directed the Joint Registrar to examine the records requisitioned from the office of Sub-Registrar, in light of the orders passed by this Court. He stated that vide orders dated 12.03.2025 and 15.04.2025 the Joint Registrar has confirmed the findings returned by the District Magistrate (South) in report dated



05.02.2025 and gave concurrent findings qua forged sale deed dated 18.12.2023 and illegal sale deeds dated 09.07.2020, 29.07.2020, 29.07.2020.

3.2. He stated that counsel for the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 in presence of Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 at the hearing on 01.05.2025 fairly submitted that in view of the report of the District Magistrate (South) and inquiries conducted by Joint Registrar, the said Defendants do not oppose the reliefs sought in the present suit and also confirmed that they have seen the Plaintiff for the first time in Court on 01.05.2025, and she is not the same person who held out herself as Vendor at the time of execution of sale deeds dated 29.07.2020.

3.3. He stated that in these undisputed facts this Court is empowered under Order XV of the CPC, to pronounce judgment, upon finding that the parties are not at issue, on question of law or fact. In this regard, he relies upon the judgment of this Court in **Meenakshi Manna v. Smt. Suriti Manna and Another**⁵. He has filed his written submission on 07.05.2025.

Arguments on behalf of the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4

4. Learned counsel for the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 stated that Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 are senior citizen and have spent their life earning i.e., Rs. 2,20,50,000 (approximately) towards the purchase of the Suit Property.

4.1. He stated that the entire payment has been made either by RTGS or cheque to bank accounts of Lady impersonating as Plaintiff (along with Defendant No.1) and Defendant No. 2 respectively.

⁵ 2022:DHC:1877.



4.2. He stated that all the four (4) sale deeds i.e., 18.12.2013, 09.07.2020, 29.07.2020 and 29.07.2020 have been deposited by the said Defendants in this Court and the same are on record.

4.3. He stated that in these facts the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 contends that they are bonafide purchaser of the Suit Property without any notice of the fraud committed by Defendant No. 1, Defendant No. 2 and Lady impersonating as Plaintiff.

4.4. He stated that Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 accepts the report of the District Magistrate (South) and findings of Joint Registrar and reserve their right to avail legal remedies against Defendant Nos. 1 and 2 as well as the Lady who impersonated as Plaintiff.

4.5. He stated that however, Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 need the Suit Property for a further period of 15 months till the time their under-construction family property is constructed, so that they can vacate the Suit Property and shift to the said family property. He stated that the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 are willing to pay Rs. 50,000/- per month as user/occupation charges to the Plaintiff till 31.07.2026.

4.6. He stated that the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 have joined investigation in an FIR No. 0319/2023 registered qua the dispute between a third party and Plaintiff and Defendant No.1 and the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 have also filed protest reply to the investigation officer ('IO') on 04.01.2024.

4.7. He stated that considering that Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 are bonafide purchasers this Court may while directing cancellation of illegal sale deeds



pass directions for refund of Stamp Duty of Rs. 10,50,000/- to save the interest of Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 to that extent. In this regard, he relies upon **Committee-GFIL v. Libra Buildtech (P) Ltd.**⁶

Arguments on behalf of Defendant No.2

5. Learned counsel for the Defendant No.2 at the hearing dated 27.05.2025 stated that Defendant No.2 has seen the Plaintiff herein for the first time on 27.05.2025. He stated that an affidavit of the like date has also been filed stating the said fact. He stated that Plaintiff present in Court is not the Lady who appeared before the Sub-Registrar on 09.07.2020 and 29.07.2020 for executing the said illegal sale deeds.

5.1. He stated that on 09.07.2020, the Lady impersonating as Plaintiff executed a registered Sale Deed in favor of the Defendant No. 2 for the sale of Ground Floor and it was witnessed by Defendant No. 1 who had availed loan from Defendant No. 2. He stated that therefore, the Defendant No.2 is a bonafide purchaser without any notice of the fraud played by Defendant No. 1.

5.2. He stated that on 29.07.2020 the Defendant No. 2 sold the Ground Floor to the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4. He stated that Defendant No. 1 along with Lady impersonating as Plaintiff was also present.

5.3. He stated that Defendant No. 2 has perused the report of District Magistrate (South) and findings of Joint Registrar and accepts the same. He stated that Defendant No. 2 concedes that the illegal Sale Deed dated 09.07.2020 relied upon by him is liable to be cancelled as the Plaintiff, who

⁶ (2015) 16 SCC 31.



is the rightful title holder herein had not executed the said document on 09.07.2020.

5.4. He stated that the Defendant No. 2 has filed a complaint dated 02.10.2024 with Police Station ('PS') GK-I, against the Lady impersonating as Plaintiff and also against Defendant No.1. He stated that Defendant No. 2 reserves his right to initiate appropriate proceedings in accordance with law against the Defendant No.1 and Lady impersonating as Plaintiff.

Analysis and Findings

6. This Court has heard learned counsels for the parties and perused the record. The relevant facts of the case have already been set out at paragraph nos. 2 to 2.14 of the judgment.

7. The Plaintiff has sought declaration, permanent injunction, mandatory injunction, recovery of possession and cancellation of the illegal sale deeds dated 09.07.2020, 29.07.2020 (both for entire Ground Floor) and 29.07.2020 (for Rear Stilt Area) by which Defendant Nos. 2, 3 and 4 claim ownership of the Suit Property. Further the Plaintiff has also sought declaration of forgery qua the sale deed dated 18.12.2013 produced by Defendant Nos. 3 and 4. The Plaintiff seeks a declaration that she is the owner of the Suit Property by virtue of the genuine sale deed dated 18.12.2013.

8. The Plaintiff claims absolute ownership of the Suit Property by virtue of registered sale deed dated 18.12.2013, executed by Mr. Gurmit Ram Nafri in favour of the Plaintiff. Further the Plaintiff traces her title in the Suit Property through sale deeds dated 21.12.1962, 26.08.1964, 21.04.2008, and 11.03.2010, which show that Mr. Gurmit Ram Nafri was the last recorded owner prior to the Plaintiff. The said chain of title documents qua the Suit Property till 18.12.2013 forms a part of an unbroken chain and are duly



registered with the concerned Sub-Registrar. The Plaintiff, therefore, claims absolute title to the Suit Property on the basis of the sale deed dated 18.12.2013, duly registered documents forming part of the public record.

9. The facts evidenced by documents on record show that Defendant No.1 (erstwhile tenant of the Plaintiff) with a mala fide intent, impersonated the Plaintiff by presenting another woman/lady (imposter) as the Plaintiff before the concerned Sub-Registrar as well as Defendant Nos. 2, 3 and 4; and, acting through such impersonation/imposter, Defendant No. 1 got the illegal sale deeds dated 09.07.2020, 29.07.2020 and 29.07.2020 executed with the objective of causing wrongful loss to the Plaintiff and securing unlawful gain for himself.

10. At this stage, it would be pertinent to refer to the orders passed by this Court in the previous hearings in the captioned suit.

10.1. By an interim order dated 04.01.2022, this Court upon being satisfied that the Plaintiff has made out a prima-facie case in her favour, directed the Defendants to maintain the status quo in respect of the possession and title of the Suit Property. The said order is in continuance till date.

10.2. Summons in the present suit were issued vide order dated 04.01.2022. Since the Defendant No.1 was unserved, fresh summons were issued vide order dated 04.03.2022. It was observed in order dated 07.04.2022 that Defendant No.1 is still unserved. The Plaintiff thereafter, filed an I.A. No. 21767/2022 under Order V Rule 20 of CPC seeking substituted service of Defendant No.1 through publication; the said application was allowed vide order dated 06.03.2023. This Court vide order dated 09.03.2023 observed that the Defendant No.1 is deemed to be served through publication. Lastly, vide



order dated 24.07.2024 right of the Defendant No.1 to file written statement was closed.

10.3. It is the Plaintiff's stand that she is the absolute owner of the suit property by virtue of sale deed dated 18.12.2013. Plaintiff's name is Lt. Col. Dr. Yasmin Yusufzai Retd. (Dr. Yasmin). Defendant Nos. 2, 3 and 4 entered appearance and took a stand that it was Dr. Yasmin who had executed the sale deeds dated 09.07.2020, 29.07.2020 and 29.07.2020. In response, Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff stated that she had never appeared before the concerned Sub-Registrar for execution of the aforesaid three (3) sale deeds and she raised a plea that she has been impersonated before the Sub-Registrar. Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff also stated that she had not received any part of the consideration referred to in the aforesaid sale deeds.

10.4. In these facts, the Plaintiff filed an application i.e., I.A. No. 02/2022 seeking to summon complete registration records and video-recording in relation to registration of illegal sale deeds dated 09.07.2020, 29.07.2020 and 29.07.2020, from the office of Sub-Registrar, Sub-District V-A, Hauz Khas, Delhi in relation to Suit Property. The said application was allowed vide order dated 29.04.2022. Subsequently the said documents were brought on record by the concerned Sub-Registrar except for the video-recording, which was not available in the records of the Sub-Registrar. It was stated by the Sub-Registrar that no such video recording is made at the time of registration of a sale deed.

10.5. The Defendant No.5/Sub-Registrar filed an application under Order I Rule 10 of CPC, seeking deletion from array of parties. The said application was listed before this Court on 29.07.2024.



The Defendant No.5/Sub-Registrar produced before this Court a copy of the sale deed dated 18.12.2013 as available in its record. Upon comparison, this Court found that the said copy corresponds to the sale deed dated 18.12.2013, which is in the custody of the Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff and it does 'not' match with the sale deed dated 18.12.2013 relied upon by the Defendant Nos. 2 to 4.

It was thus prima facie apparent that the sale deed dated 18.12.2013 which is in the custody of the Plaintiff is the only genuine document available in the record of the Defendant No.5/Sub-Registrar's office. Whereas, the sale deed dated 18.12.2013 relied upon by the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 was not available in the records of the Sub-Registrar and therefore, appeared to be non-genuine.

The Defendant Nos. 2 to 4 were relying upon the non-genuine sale deed dated 18.12.2013 (in their custody) for claiming title by virtue of the sale deeds dated 09.07.2020, 29.07.2020 and 29.07.2020.

The Court compared the Plaintiff/Dr Yasmin's photographs affixed on the verified sale deed dated 18.12.2013 produced by the Plaintiff, with the sale deed dated 09.07.2020 produced by Defendant Nos. 3 and 4; and observed that the photographs of Dr. Yasmin did not match. This Court recorded that the identity of the Vendor on the illegal sale deed dated 09.07.2020 (executed in favour of Defendant No. 2) prima facie does not match with the identity of the Vendee/Dr. Yasmin on the sale deed dated 18.12.2013, available in the records of Defendant No.5/Sub-Registrar.

In these facts, the Court observed that before consideration of the said application filed by Defendant No.5 for its deletion, it is imperative that the District Magistrate (South) holds an inquiry to ascertain the veracity of the



sale deed(s) dated 18.12.2013 produced by the parties as well as the sale deeds dated 09.07.2020, 29.07.2020 and 29.07.2020 relied upon by the Defendants. 10.6. Separately, in the order dated 29.07.2024, this Court noted that sale consideration under the illegal sale deed dated 09.07.2020 were made in favour of the Vendor (i.e., Lady impersonating as Plaintiff) in an account held in the AU Small Finance Bank. Therefore, the Court directed the General Manager of the AU Small Finance Bank to produce complete records including account opening form and bank statement pertaining to account no. 1911210425760340 for the period 01.07.2020 until 31.07.2024.

The said direction was complied with by the AU Small Finance Bank as recorded in the subsequent order dated 06.02.2025.

10.7. The report as directed vide order dated 29.07.2024 was filed by the District Magistrate (South) on 05.02.2025 and the said fact was recorded in the order dated 06.02.2025. The District Magistrate (South) gave the following key findings in the said report dated 05.02.2025, which reads as under:

- (a) That the sale deed dated 18.12.2013 produced by the Plaintiff is identical to the original of the sale deed dated 18.12.2013 in the records available at the Defendant No.5/Sub-Registrar's office.
- (b) The photograph of Vendee on the sale deed dated 18.12.2013 produced by the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 does not match with the photograph of Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff (as Vendee) in the sale deed dated 18.12.2013 produced by the Plaintiff as well as in the sale deed dated 18.12.2013 available in the records of Defendant No.5/Sub-Registrar.
- (c) That some *random* lady appeared before the Sub-Registrar's office on 09.07.2020 and 29.07.2020 portraying herself as Dr. Yasmin



for registration of the illegal sale deeds and the same *random* lady has forged the non-genuine sale deed dated 18.12.2013.

10.8. Thereafter, the Court vide order dated 06.02.2025 directed the Joint Registrar to examine the records called from the office of Defendant No.5/Sub-Registrar as well as the report of the District Magistrate (South) dated 05.02.2025. The Joint Registrar gave its report in the order dated 12.03.2025, wherein following key findings were returned:

- (a) That the sale deed dated 18.12.2013 in custody of the Plaintiff is same as that available in the record of the Defendant No.5/Sub-Registrar.
- (b) That the original sale deed dated 09.07.2020 filed by the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 match with the sale deed dated 09.07.2020 which was produced by the office of Defendant No.5. The photographs of the of Vendor (purported to be the Plaintiff) in the sale deed dated 09.07.2020 does not match with the photograph of Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff herein on her Aadhar Card.
- (c) That the Aadhar Card and PAN Card numbers mentioned in the sale deed dated 09.07.2020 are of the Plaintiff but the particulars of address of the Lady impersonating as Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff does not match with the address given on Aadhar Card and PAN Card of the Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff.
- (d) That the sale deed dated 29.07.2020 for the Ground Floor filed by the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 matches with the sale deed dated 29.07.2020 in records of the Defendant No.5. The Joint Registrar recorded that Lady impersonating as Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff is mentioned as the second witness in the said sale deed. The Aadhar Card number



mentioned in the sale deed dated 29.07.2020 are of Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff but the particular of address of the Lady impersonating as Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff does not match with the address on Aadhar Card of the Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff.

(e) That the sale deed dated 29.07.2020 for the Rear Stilt Area of the Suit Property filed by the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 matches with the sale deed dated 29.07.2020 in the records of the Defendant No.5. The photographs of the Vendor (purported to be of Plaintiff) on the sale deed dated 29.07.2020 does not match with the photograph of the Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff on her Aadhar Card. The Aadhar Card and PAN Card numbers mentioned in the sale deed dated 29.07.2020 are of the Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff but the particulars of address of the Lady impersonating as Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff does not match with the address on Aadhar Card of the Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff.

(f) The Joint Registrar also gave the following Mark numbers to the sale deeds in question: (i) **Mark A1:** Sale deed dated 18.12.2013⁷ filed by the Defendant No.5/Sub-Registrar (ii) **Mark B1:** Sale deed dated 09.07.2020 filed by the Defendant No.5/Sub-Registrar for the Ground Floor; (iii) **Mark B2:** Sale deed dated 29.07.2020 filed by the Defendant No.5/Sub-Registrar for the Ground Floor; and (iv) **Mark B3:** Sale deed dated 29.07.2020 filed by the Defendant No.5/Sub-Registrar for the Rear Stilt Area.

10.9. In view of some reservations expressed by Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 vis-à-vis findings of the Joint Registrar dated 12.03.2025, this Court vide order

⁷ The original of this sale deed has been produced by the Plaintiff and the same is a genuine sale deed.



dated 19.03.2025 further directed the Joint Registrar to examine (i) the original identification documents of Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff; (ii) the photograph of the alleged Dr. Yasmin on the non-genuine sale deed dated 18.12.2013 produced by Defendant Nos. 3 and 4; and (iii) the photograph of alleged Dr. Yasmin (i.e., Lady impersonating as Plaintiff) as they appear on the loan agreement of AU Small Finance Bank; and to return a finding if it is same as that of the Dr. Yasmin/the Plaintiff before this Court.

10.10. In compliance of the above-said directions, the Joint Registrar vide order dated 15.04.2025 gave the following key findings:

- (a) That the photograph of the Lady impersonating as the Plaintiff on sale deed dated 18.12.2013 produced by the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 does not match with the photograph of the Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff in the sale deed dated 18.12.2013 in records of the Defendant No.5/Sub-Registrar.
- (b) That the PAN Card and Aadhar Card details of the Plaintiff on all the illegal sale deeds are same, but the address details mentioned therein does not match with that on the Aadhar Card of the Plaintiff.
- (c) That the stamp paper on non-genuine sale deed dated 18.12.2013 filed by the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 is 0001584056, whereas the stamp paper on the verified sale deed dated 18.12.2013 available with the Defendant No.5/Sub-Registrar is 0000877288.
- (d) That the photograph of the Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff on Election Identity Card and on the sale-deed dated 18.12.2013 with the Defendant No.5/Sub-Registrar is same.



(e) That the photograph of the Lady impersonating as Plaintiff on account opening form of the AU Small Finance Bank does not match with the photograph of the Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff on her Election Identity Card issued on 17.12.2019.

(f) The Joint Registrar assigned a Mark number to the forged sale deed dated 18.12.2013 produced and filed by the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 as **Mark D1**.

10.11. Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 as well as Plaintiff/Dr. Yasmin were personally present in Court on 01.05.2025. The said Defendants submitted that they have seen Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff for the first time in the Court on 01.05.2025 and she is not the same Lady who appeared before the concerned Sub-Registrar for execution of the illegal sale deeds.

In addition, learned counsel for the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 submitted that (i) the said Defendants have been duped by the Defendant No.1 in connivance with others; (ii) Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 are bonafide purchaser of the Suit Property; and (iii) Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 will take steps to file their complaint against Defendant No. 1 and his associates for the fraud played in this matter.

This Court in its order dated 01.05.2025 recorded the aforesaid submissions of Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 to the above effect.

10.12. During the course of hearing on 27.05.2025, the Defendant No. 2 as well filed an affidavit dated 27.05.2025, wherein the Defendant No.2 deposed as under:

“4. That I further state that the sale deed pertaining to the ground floor of the property bearing House No. S-398, Greater Kailash Part-1, New Delhi — 110048, registered as **Sale Deed** No. 2666 in Book No. I, Volume No. 3371, Page. No. 92, dated **09.07.2020** **was not executed by the lady who is present**



before this Hon'ble Court today i.e., 27.05.2025 and has identified herself as Yasmin Yusufzai. I most respectfully submit that the executant of the said registered sale deed was a different individual, and the person appearing today neither resembles nor corresponds to the said executant in any manner known to me."

(Emphasis supplied)

Similarly, Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 also filed an affidavit dated 27.05.2025, wherein the said Defendants deposed that they met Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff for the first time on 01.05.2025, when she appeared before this Court and they did not meet her on 29.07.2020 before the office of the Sub-Registrar.

10.13. The aforesaid unequivocal statements of Defendant Nos. 2, 3 and 4 proved beyond any doubt that Plaintiff did not appear before the office of Sub-Registrar on 09.07.2020 and 29.07.2020 for executing illegal sale deeds in favour of Defendant Nos. 2, 3 and 4.

10.14. In view of the report dated 05.02.2025 submitted by the District Magistrate (South), the findings of the Joint Registrar dated 12.03.2025 and 15.04.2025 as well as the admissions of Defendant Nos. 2, 3 and 4, this Court passed an order dated 27.05.2025 observing that the sale deeds marked as **Mark B1⁸, B2⁹ and B3¹⁰** are illegal, non-est, null and void and therefore, it cannot create any right, title or interest in favour of the Defendant Nos. 2, 3 and 4. This Court held that report of District Magistrate (South) and inquiries undertaken by learned Joint Registrar establish that the Plaintiff herein did not execute the illegal sale deeds and that a Lady impersonating as the Plaintiff

⁸ Sale deed dated 09.07.2020 executed in favour of Defendant No. 2.

⁹ Sale deed dated 29.07.2020 executed in favour of Defendant Nos. 3 and 4.

¹⁰ Sale deed dated 29.07.2020 executed in favour of Defendant Nos. 3 and 4.



appeared before the concerned Sub-Registrar on 09.07.2020 and 29.07.2020 to execute the said illegal sale deeds.

11. At this juncture, it would be apposite to refer to the law settled with respect to Order XV Rule 1 of CPC, which empowers the Court to pronounce judgment at once, upon finding that the parties are not on an issue of any question of law or fact. A Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **Meenakshi Manna** (supra), while allowing a revision petition filed against an order passed by the Trial Court, whereby the application under Order XV CPC was rejected, held as under: -

“5. It becomes pertinent to note that Order XV Rule 1 of the Code is a power conferred upon a court to pronounce judgement where it finds on the first hearing of the suit that parties do not appear to be at issue on any question of law or a fact. Order XII Rule 6 of the Code, on the other hand, contemplates the rendering of a judgement on admission. Insofar as the power conferred under Order XII Rule 6 is concerned, it is by now well- settled that a judgement of admission can be rendered only in case the Court discerns from the pleadings that a material fact which would warrant the suit being decreed has been unequivocally admitted. If the Order XV, on the other hand, places an obligation upon the Court to sift through the pleadings of parties and to consider whether a triable issue arises or whether the parties can be said to be at variance on a material question of law or fact which would warrant the suit being tried on merits. Trial Judge finds to the contrary, it may proceed to pronounce judgement forthwith.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

12. The judgements relied upon by the Plaintiff also hold to this effect and it would be relevant to refer to para ‘11’ of **A.N. Kaul v. Neerja Kaul and Another**¹¹ which reads as under:-

“11. Not only so, Order XV of the CPC empowers the Court to, upon finding that the parties are not on an issue of any question of law or fact, pronounce judgment at once. Thus even if there is no express admission in the written statement but an intelligent reading of the written statement shows the propositions or pleas taken to be not material and no issue to be arising therefrom, the Court is still entitled to pass a decree forthwith.”

¹¹ 2018 SCC OnLine Del 9597.



13. In light of the report of the District Magistrate (South), inquires undertaken by learned Joint Registrar, affidavits of the Defendant Nos. 2, 3 and 4 dated 27.05.2025 and findings recorded by this Court in the order dated 27.05.2025 it is unequivocally clear that the Plaintiff herein was impersonated by a Lady at the behest of Defendant No.1 for execution of the sale deeds dated 09.07.2020, 29.07.2020 and 29.07.2020, making them illegal, non-est, null and void.

13.1. The legitimate and rightful ownership of the Plaintiff in the Suit Property is established from the verified sale deed dated 18.12.2013 in the possession of the Plaintiff, which matches **Mark A1** in the record of the Defendant No.5.

13.2. The sale deed dated 18.12.2013 produced by Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 marked as **Mark D1** does not match with the validly executed sale deed dated 18.12.2013 available in record of the Defendant No.5 i.e., **Mark A1** proving the same to be forged and non-genuine. Since it is this non-genuine sale deed which was relied upon by Defendant No. 1 and the imposter, it makes the transactions leading to registration of sale deed dated 09.07.2020 (**Mark B1**) in favour of Defendant No. 2 on the basis of forged sale deed dated 18.12.2013 (**Mark D1**) as illegal, non-est, null and void.

13.3. In view of the aforesaid findings, it can be concluded without an iota of doubt that Defendant No.2 had acquired no right, title or interest in the Ground Floor vide the illegal sale deed dated 09.07.2020 (**Mark B1**). Therefore, as on date of execution of the subsequent sale deed dated 29.07.2020 (**Mark B2**), the Defendant No.2 did not possess any right, title or interest in the



Ground Floor which could have been conveyed to the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4. Thus, the sale deeds dated 09.07.2020 and 29.07.2020 qua the Ground Floor are illegal and non-est.

13.4. Lastly, the illegal sale deed dated 29.07.2020 qua Rear Stilt Area (**Mark B3**) was again executed by the Lady impersonating as the Plaintiff and therefore, this sale deed also could not have transferred/conveyed any right, title or interest in the Rear Stilt Area in favour of the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4. Thus, the sale deed dated 29.07.2020 qua Rear Stilt Area is illegal and non-est.

14. It was contended by the Defendant Nos. 2, 3 and 4, that they had paid their respective sale considerations for the purchase of the Suit Property in the bank account in the AU Small Finance Bank held by the Vendor i.e., the lady impersonating the Plaintiff. Thus, AU Small Finance Bank was directed vide order dated 24.07.2024 to produce the record of the said bank account, which was produced by the said bank vide affidavit dated 14.01.2025. The account opening form and the bank statement has been perused by this Court. The photograph of the Lady (i.e., account holder) on the account opening form does not match with the photograph of Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff herein on her identification documents.

Further the bank statement shows that the said bank account was opened by the Defendant No.1 along with the Lady impersonating as Plaintiff 'only' for the purpose of receiving/channelising the sale consideration under the illegal sale deeds¹²; and the same is evident from the fact that there are only '8' major credit entries out of which two (2) have been made by the

¹² 09.07.2020, 29.07.2020 and 29.07.2020



Defendant No.1 himself, one (1) is made by the Defendant No.2 and five (5) have been made by Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 collectively.

The bank statement shows that the Plaintiff herein has not received any amounts paid by Defendant Nos. 2, 3 and 4 under the illegal sale deeds. The payments have been received by Defendant No. 1 and the Lady impersonating as Plaintiff.

15. In view of the undisputed material placed on record and findings recorded hereinabove, this Court is satisfied that no triable issues arise for consideration on the basis of the pleadings of the parties; which would warrant the suit to be tried on merits.

Defendant Nos. 2, 3 and 4 admit the absolute title/ownership of the Plaintiff herein in the Suit Property and acknowledge that she did not transfer her right, title and interest in their favour. Defendant Nos. 2, 3 and 4 have not disputed the fact that person shown as Vendor in the illegal sale deeds is not the Plaintiff herein who they have seen for the first time in this Court and Plaintiff herein did not appear on 09.07.2020 and 29.07.2020 before the Sub-Registrar for execution of the illegal sale deeds.

16. In the overall conspectus, the captioned suit is decreed and the reliefs of declaration sought at prayer clauses (I), (II) and (III) as well as the relief of injunction sought at prayer clauses (IV), (V) and (VI) are hereby granted.

16.1. In view of the grant of declaration that the sale deeds dated 09.07.2020, 29.07.2020 and 29.07.2020 are illegal, non-est, null and void, the said illegal sale deeds ought to be cancelled and therefore, the Registrar (Original) is directed to cancel the said illegal sale deeds dated 09.07.2020, 29.07.2020 and



29.07.2020, which are on record and handover the custody of the said cancelled illegal sale deeds to the Plaintiff, to prevent any mischief.

The forged sale deed dated 18.12.2013 (**Mark D1**) has also been deposited before this Court by Defendant Nos. 3 and 4. The said sale deed will be endorsed as forged by the Registrar (Original) and handover the custody of the said deed to the Plaintiff.

The custody of the said cancelled deeds and forged deed will be retained by the Plaintiff for production before the Investigating Officer ('IO') in FIR No. 319/2023 or any other criminal proceedings.

16.2. The Plaintiff is granted liberty to produce the said cancelled illegal sale deeds and forged deed before the IO in FIR No. 319/2023 or in any other criminal proceedings.

16.3. It is further directed that Defendant No. 5 i.e., the concerned Sub-Registrar shall make a due note of the cancellation of the illegal sale deeds dated 09.07.2020, 29.07.2020 and 29.07.2020 in its record so as to avoid any further mischief on the basis of the said illegal sale deeds.

A compliance report will be filed by Defendant No. 5 within six (6) weeks from date of cancellation of the said illegal sale deeds by the Registrar (Original).

17. In view of the injunction granted in favour of Plaintiff vide this judgment, the interim order dated 04.01.2022 stands merged with the said injunction.

18. Considering that Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 have acknowledged the Plaintiff's ownership over the Suit Property and have not opposed the



cancellation of the illegal sale deeds, this Court is of the view that there is merit in their request for grant of time to vacate the Suit Property.

18.1. Therefore, the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 are granted time till 31.07.2026 to vacate the Suit Property and restore vacant and peaceful possession of the Suit Property to the Plaintiff.

18.2. Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 are also directed to continue payment of monthly user charges of Rs. 50,000/- to the Plaintiff on or before 05th day of every month, as directed vide order dated 27.05.2025, till the Suit Property is vacated and possession is handed over to the Plaintiff.

18.3. Further, liberty is being reserved as prayed for to the said Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 to avail their remedies in accordance with law against the Defendant Nos. 1, 2 and the Lady who impersonated as the Plaintiff.

19. Since the Defendant No.2 has also accepted the ownership of the Plaintiff qua the Suit Property and has conceded for cancellation of the illegal sale deeds, this Court without expressing any opinion on the conduct of the said Defendant No.2, grants him liberty to avail its remedies in accordance with law against the Defendant No.1 and the Lady who impersonated as Plaintiff for execution of the illegal sale deed dated 09.07.2020.

20. Lastly, liberty is also reserved to the Plaintiff to avail her remedies in accordance with law against the Defendant No.1 and the Lady who impersonated as Plaintiff for executing illegal sale deeds.

21. In the facts of this case, the sale deed dated 29.07.2020 (**Mark B2**) pertaining to the Ground Floor and sale deed dated 29.07.2020 (**Mark B3**) pertaining to the Rear Stilt Area, executed in favour of Defendant Nos. 3 and



4 has been directed to be cancelled. The said sale deeds were executed as a result of a fraud committed by Defendant No. 1 along with a Lady impersonating the Plaintiff on Defendant Nos. 3 and 4. Further the role, if any of the Defendant No. 2, will be a subject matter of examination in a criminal proceeding. However, on the basis of material available on record, this Court does not find that Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 were aware about this fraud and the Plaintiff has also accepted this position. In these facts since the Court has directed cancellation of the aforesaid sale deeds, this Court directs that the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 will be at liberty to approach the State Government for refund of the stamp duty amount paid on the illegal sale deeds. It is clarified that for the purposes of reckoning limitation under Section 49(d)(2) read with Section 50 of the Stamp Act, 1899 ('Act of 1899'), the limitation shall commence in favour of the said Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 from the date of this judgment. (Re: **Committee-GFIL** (supra)¹³)

22. This Court considers it apposite to set out the findings arrived at and directions issued by this Court:

- (i) The Plaintiff vide registered sale deed dated 18.12.2013 (**Mark A1**) acquired absolute ownership of the Suit Property.
- (ii) Defendant No. 1 was inducted as a tenant in the year 2014. Plaintiff filed a suit for recovery of possession and arrears of rent before the District Court. The said Court vide order dated 04.05.2019 directed Defendant No. 1 to maintain *status quo*. The said Court passed a decree for possession in favour of Plaintiff and against Defendant No. 1 on 17.07.2020.

¹³ Para '18', '43' and '44'.



(iii) Defendant No. 1 on 08.06.2020 along with a Lady impersonating as Plaintiff opened a bank account with AU Small Finance Bank.

(iv) Defendant No. 1 along with a Lady impersonating as Plaintiff executed sale deed dated 09.07.2020 (**Mark B1**) in favour of Defendant No. 2 with respect to the Ground Floor portion of the Suit Property. The Plaintiff herein did not appear before the Sub-Registrar on 09.07.2020 and she was impersonated by a Lady on the instructions of Defendant No. 1. In this sale deed (**Mark B1**) Defendant No. 1 misrepresented Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff as his wife whereas admittedly Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff is not married to Defendant No. 1.

Defendant No. 2 admits that the Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff is not the lady who appeared before the Sub-Registrar on 09.07.2020. The Joint Registrar as well in its findings returned on 12.03.2025 and 15.04.2025 has confirmed that the relevant photographs on the illegal sale deed does not match with the Plaintiff's photographs on her identification documents. In these facts, the illegality of the sale deed dated 09.07.2020 (**Mark B1**) stands proved and no title devolved upon Defendant No. 2 by virtue of this sale deed (**Mark B1**).

(v) In view of the aforesaid finding, the subsequent sale deed dated 29.07.2020 (**Mark B2**) executed by Defendant No. 2 in favour of Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 for the Ground Floor portion cannot transfer any right title or interest in their favour. Pertinently, the Lady impersonating as Plaintiff signed as an attesting witness to this sale deed. However, Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 confirm that the said Lady is not the Plaintiff who has instituted this suit and holds title under the verified sale deed dated 18.12.2013 (**Mark A1**).



(vi) Defendant No.1 along with a Lady impersonating as Plaintiff executed sale deed dated 29.07.2020 (**Mark B3**) in favour of Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 for the Rear Stilt Area. Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff herein did not appear before the Sub-Registrar on 29.07.2020 and she was impersonated by a Lady on the instructions of Defendant No. 1. In this sale deed (**Mark B3**) as well Defendant No. 1 misrepresented Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff as his wife whereas admittedly Dr. Yasmin/Plaintiff is not married to Defendant No. 1. Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 admit that the Plaintiff is not the lady who appeared before the Sub-Registrar on 29.07.2020. In these facts, the illegality of the sale deed 29.07.2020 (**Mark B3**) stands proved and no title devolved upon Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 by virtue of this sale deed (**Mark B3**).

(vii) Defendant Nos. 2, 3 and 4 have asserted that they made payments to the Lady impersonating as Plaintiff through bank transfers which were credited in the bank account held with AU Small Finance Bank. The records of the said bank account were summoned, which shows that the photographs of the account holder do not match with the Plaintiff and instead match with the Lady who impersonated the Plaintiff before the Sub-Registrar on 09.07.2020 and 29.07.2020. Moreover, this bank account is held jointly by the Lady who impersonated as Plaintiff with Defendant No.1. It is thus apparent that Defendant No. 1 is a direct beneficiary of the sale consideration paid under the illegal sale deeds. This bank account was opened on 08.06.2020, immediately before the registration of the illegal sale deeds.

(viii) Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 produced from their custody a sale deed



dated 18.12.2013 (**Mark D1**) purporting to be the title document by which Vendor acquired title in the Suit Property. However, District Magistrate (South) in its report dated 05.02.2025 has confirmed that sale deed (**Mark D1**) does not match with the original sale deed dated 18.12.2013 available in its records. It is thus apparent that sale deed (**Mark D1**) is a forged document furnished by Defendant No. 1 and the Lady impersonating as Plaintiff to the Defendant Nos. 3 and 4.

(ix) Thus, the sale deeds **Mark B1**, **Mark B2** and **Mark B3** are illegal and liable to be delivered up and cancelled in the record of the concerned Sub-Registrar.

(x) The sale deeds **Mark B1**, **Mark B2** and **Mark B3** have been deposited before this Court by Defendant Nos. 3 and 4. The said sale deeds will be endorsed as cancelled by the Registrar (Original) and the custody of the said cancelled sale deeds will be retained by the Plaintiff for production before the IO in FIR No. 319/2023 or any other criminal proceedings. The sale deeds i.e., **Mark B1**, **Mark B2** and **Mark B3** are also registered with the Sub-Registrar and a copy of the decree be sent to the said concerned Sub-Registrar for making a note in its record with respect to the facts of cancellation of sale deeds i.e., **Mark B1**, **Mark B2** and **Mark B3**.

(xi) The forged sale deed dated 18.12.2013 (**Mark D1**) has also been deposited before this Court by Defendant Nos. 3 and 4. The said sale deed will be endorsed as forged by the Registrar (Original). The custody of the said sale deed will be retained by the Plaintiff for production before the IO in FIR No. 319/2023 or any other criminal proceedings.



(xii) The Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 are permitted to continue in possession of the Suit Property until 31.07.2026 upon payment of user/occupation charges of Rs. 50,000 per month. Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 acknowledge the absolute ownership of the Plaintiff and shall handover peaceful and vacant possession of the Suit Property on or before 31.07.2026. Plaintiff has consented to these terms in view of the judgment.

(xiii) Plaintiff will be entitled to pursue its criminal complaint against Defendant No.1, the Lady impersonating as Plaintiff and any other person involved. Plaintiff has stated that she will not pursue criminal proceedings against Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 in view of the said Defendants accepting the judgment of this Court and this Court findings that they are bona fide purchaser without notice of the fraud.

(xiv) Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 will be entitled to pursue its criminal complaint against Defendant No. 1, the Lady impersonating as Plaintiff, Defendant No. 2 and any other person involved. This Court has however not returned any findings against Defendant No. 2 vis-à-vis his role if any in the transaction or his knowledge of the fraud played by Defendant No. 1.

(xv) Defendant Nos. 3 and 4 are granted liberty to approach the competent authority for refund of the stamp duty paid towards the cancelled sale deeds. The limitation for approaching the competent authority as per Section 49(d)(2) read with Section 50 of the Act of 1899 shall reckon from the date of this judgment.

23. With the aforesaid findings and directions issued, the suit stands decreed.



24. The Registry is directed to draw up the decree-sheet accordingly.
25. A copy of this judgment is directed to be sent to the Registrar (Original) and concerned Sub-Registrar for information and compliance.
26. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA
(JUDGE)

AUGUST 26, 2025/sk

Click here to check corrigendum, if any