



2025:DHC:5937



§~30

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% ***Date of Decision: 21.07.2025***+ **C.R.P. 171/2023 & CM APPL. 34462/2023****BABULAL MUNDHARA**PetitionerThrough: Mr. Seemant K. Garg & Mrs.
Himanshu, Advocates.

versus

SANJEEV SONI & ORS.RespondentsThrough: Mr. Vinod Kumar Mantoo, Mr. Hem
Kumar & Ms. Nupur Mantoo,
Advocates for R-1.
Mr. Puneet Yadav, Advocate for R-3.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU****TARA VITASTA GANJU, J.: (Oral)**

1. The present Petition has been filed on behalf of the Petitioner under Section 115 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 [hereinafter referred to as "CPC"] against the order dated 01.04.2022 passed by learned ASCJ, Central, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi [hereinafter referred to as "Impugned Order"]. By the Impugned Order, two Applications under Order VII Rule 14(3) of the CPC and three Applications under Section 151 of the CPC filed by the Petitioner has been dismissed by the learned Trial Court.

2. These Applications have been filed for the following reliefs:

- (i) Application under Order VII Rule 14 (3) CPC for seeking permission to file additional documents;
- (ii) Application under Order VII Rule 14 (3) read with Section 151 CPC seeking permission to file the site plan;



2025:DHC:5937



- (iii) Application under Section 151 CPC seeking permission to repair the roof of the tenanted rooms in the suit property bearing no. 63/215-217, Second floor, Bagh Diwar, Fatehpuri, Delhi;
- (iv) Application under Section 151 CPC to modify/correct the order sheet dated 03.07.2017; and
- (v) Application under Section 151 CPC to file additional list of witnesses on 27.11.2017.

3. Learned Counsel for the Respondents submits that the maintainability of this Petition is a subject matter of challenge. It is no longer *res integra* that the provisions of Section 115 of the CPC cannot be invoked except where an order, if made in favour of the revisionist, would have finally disposed of the suit or proceedings. This is set out in the proviso to Section 115 of the CPC below:

“Section 115 – Revision

The High Court may call for the record of any case which has been decided by any Court subordinate to such High Court and in which no appeal lies thereto, and if such subordinate Court appears

(a) to have exercised a jurisdiction not vested in it by law, or

(b) to have failed to exercise a jurisdiction so vested, or

(c) to have acted in the exercise of its jurisdiction illegally or with material irregularity,

the High Court may make such order in the case as it thinks fit:

Provided that the High Court shall not, under this section, vary or reverse any order made, or any order deciding an issue, in the course of a suit or other proceeding, except where the order, if it had been made in favour of the party applying for revision would have finally disposed of the suit or other proceedings.

[Emphasis Supplied]



3.1 The Supreme Court in *Shiv Shakti Coop. Housing Society, Nagpur v. Swaraj Developers & Ors.*¹ has held that unless the order is given in favour of the party applying for the revision would have given finality to the suit or other proceeding, a revision is not maintainable. The relevant extract of the *Shiv Shakti* case is set out below:

“32. A plain reading of Section 115 as it stands makes it clear that the stress is on the question whether the order in favour of the party applying for revision would have given finality to suit or other proceeding. If the answer is “yes” then the revision is maintainable. But on the contrary, if the answer is “no” then the revision is not maintainable. Therefore, if the impugned order is interim in nature or does not finally decide the lis, the revision will not be maintainable. The legislative intent is crystal clear. Those orders, which are interim in nature, cannot be the subject-matter of revision under Section 115. There is marked distinction in the language of Section 97(3) of the Old Amendment Act and Section 32(2)(i) of the Amendment Act. While in the former, there was a clear legislative intent to save applications admitted or pending before the amendment came into force. Such an intent is significantly absent in Section 32(2)(i). The amendment relates to procedures. No person has a vested right in a course of procedure. He has only the right of proceeding in the manner prescribed. If by a statutory change the mode of procedure is altered, the parties are to proceed according to the altered mode, without exception, unless there is a different stipulation.”

[Emphasis Supplied]

3.2 In the case of *Gayatri Devi v. Shashi Pal Singh*², the Supreme Court while relying on the *Shiv Shakti Coop. Housing Society* case has held that an order interim in nature or which does not finally decide the lis, cannot be challenged by way of a revision under Section 115 CPC.

“14. In the first place, it appears to us that the revision petition before the High Court was wholly incompetent in view of the amended provision of Section 115 CPC. The revision petition was entertained at the stage of interlocutory proceedings. As laid down by this Court in *Shiv Shakti Coop. Housing Society v. Swaraj Developers* [(2003) 6 SCC 659] an order interim

¹ (2003) 6 SCC 659

² (2005) 5 SCC 527



2025:DHC:5937



in nature or which does not finally decide the lis, cannot be challenged by way of a revision under Section 115 CPC.

[Emphasis Supplied]

4. Concededly, neither of the Applications mentioned in paragraph 2 above, would if allowed, finally dispose of the proceedings before the learned Trial Court. Thus, the Impugned Order is not an order which is amenable to challenge under Section 115 of the CPC.
5. The present Petition is accordingly dismissed. The pending Application stands closed. Liberty is however granted to the Petitioner to file appropriate proceedings *albeit* in accordance with law.
6. The parties shall act based on the digitally signed copy of the order.

TARA VITASTA GANJU, J

JULY 21, 2025/ ha