



2025:DHC:6002



\$~89, 90 & 125

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

% *Date of Decision: 22nd July, 2025*

+ CM(M) 1307/2025 & CM APPL. 43271-43272/2025
PRANAV ANSAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Madhav Khurana, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Malak Bhatt, Ms. Neeha
Nagpal, Mr. Shreyansh Chopra, Ms.
Sanjivani Pattjoshi and Ms. Kashvi
Bansal, Advocates.

Versus

VIPIN MALHOTRA & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: None.

+ CM(M) 1308/2025 & CM APPL. 43273-43274/2025
PRANAV ANSAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Madhav Khurana, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Malak Bhatt, Ms. Neeha
Nagpal, Mr. Shreyansh Chopra, Ms.
Sanjivani Pattjoshi and Ms. Kashvi
Bansal, Advocates.

Versus

MEETU MALHOTRA & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: None.

+ CM(M) 1295/2025 & CM APPL. 43151-43152/2025
PRANAV ANSAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Madhav Khurana, Sr. Advocate
with Mr. Malak Bhatt, Ms. Neeha



2025:DHC:6002



Nagpal, Mr. Shreyansh Chopra, Ms.
Sanjivani Pattjoshi and Ms. Kashvi
Bansal, Advocates.

Versus

SAURABH MALHOTRA & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. All the three petitions have been taken up together as the grievance raised by the petitioner is, virtually, the same and similar.
2. On the basis of separate complainants filed by the concerned consumer(s), there was decree against M/s. Ansal HI-Tech Township Limited in all such three complaints.
3. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that when the complaint(s) were filed, no individual was made opposite party and, eventually, decree was also against the abovesaid company only.
4. On the basis of the abovesaid decree, separate Execution Petitions were filed by the concerned decree holders. These have been registered as EA No.15/2025, EA No.16/2025 and EA No.17/2025.
5. All these Execution petitions were taken up by the learned District Commission on 02.07.2025 and observing that no payment had been brought and keeping in mind the directions given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Periyammal v. V. Rajamani, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 507*, the learned District Commission has issued warrants against several persons, including petitioner



2025:DHC:6002



herein.

6. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that neither the decree was directed against the abovesaid individual, nor was he ever Director or Shareholder in the JD Company.

7. He also, on instructions, submits that at no point of time, the decree holder had moved any application under Order XXI Rule 41 CPC and, therefore, it is not, at all, comprehensible as to on what basis, such extreme coercive process was issued against him. He supplements that no ordinary process was ever issued asking him to appear in the execution proceedings and, straightway, *non-bailable warrants* have been issued which was not warranted.

8. Undoubtedly as per directions contained in *Periyammal v. V. Rajamani* (supra), the execution petition needs to be fast-tracked but at the same time, the liberty of an individual cannot be curtailed in the manner it has been done.

9. If learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner is to be believed, neither the decree was directed against the petitioner herein nor he was a Director in the JD Company and, therefore, it is really intriguing as to on what premise, *non-bailable warrants* have been issued against the petitioner.

10. None appears on behalf of the respondent/decree holder despite advance notice.

11. During course of the arguments, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is no intention to avoid or delay the execution proceedings and the petitioner would ensure that he is duly represented before the learned District Commission on the next date of hearing and, if required, to file any response or affidavit in terms of directions to be passed in this regard by the learned District Commission.



2025:DHC:6002



12. In view of the abovesaid, while recalling the *non-bailable warrants*, in all the abovesaid three matters, the petitions are disposed of with direction to petitioner to represent himself through a counsel before the learned District Commission on the next date of hearing which is stated to be 01.08.2025.

13. Needless to say, learned District Commission would be at liberty to proceed further with the matter in accordance with law.

14. All the three petitions stand disposed of in aforesaid terms.

15. Pending applications stand disposed of.

16. A copy of this Order be given *dasti* under the signatures of Court Master.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

JULY 22, 2025/ss/SS