



\$~18

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

% ***Date of Decision: 08th August, 2025***

+ CM(M) 164/2025 & CM APPL. 4927/2025
QAYYUM KHAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sharvan Dev, Mr. Pradeep Kumar
Sharma, Mr. Shubham Garg and Ms.
Sweta, Advocates.

versus

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Mansi Jain, Advocate for
R-1/DDA.
Mr. Siddharth Gupta, Standing
Counsel for MCD/R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Petitioner is plaintiff before the learned Trial Court and expresses reservation with respect to the manner in which some documents were confronted with the plaintiff when he was under cross-examination and were given number as Exhibit PW-1/D1 to PW-1/D4.
2. He wants such documents to be de-exhibited and challenges order dated 11.08.2023 whereby his such request has not been acceded to.
3. Fact, however, remains that the adequate protection in this regard has already been granted to the plaintiff by the learned Trial Court as in the impugned order, it has also been clearly observed that it was settled law that mere exhibiting a document would not establish that the document has been



2025 :DHC:6763



duly proved as per rules of the evidence and these marks of exhibit “*or not*” are mere labels assigned to any particular document for its identification.

4. In view of the above, the grievance of the petitioner seems misconceived. He always at liberty to demonstrate before the learned Trial Court at later stage of the case that documents have not been proved in accordance with law and that these should be de-exhibited.

5. However, learned counsel for respondent/DDA would ensure that, if any such document is in Urdu language, a true translated copy in English thereof is supplied to plaintiff within eight weeks from today.

6. The present petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

7. Pending application also stands disposed of

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

AUGUST 8, 2025/ss/shs