



\$~80

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

% ***Date of Decision: 23rd April, 2025***

+ C.R.P. 115/2025 & CM APPL. 22550-22551/2025

JITENDRA SHARMAPetitioner

Through: Mr. Prashant Kumar, Advocate along
with petitioner-in-person

versus

GEETIKA SHARMARespondent

Through: None

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

CM APPL. 22550/2025 (exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

C.R.P. 115/2025 & CM APPL. 22551/2025

1. Present Revision Petition has been received on transfer.
2. The point raised herein is very short and precise.
3. Petitioner filed a suit for declaration and damages. The crux of the averments made in the suit is to the effect that he was lured into a bigamous marriage.
4. During pendency of the aforesaid suit, defendant no. 1 filed an application seeking permission to place on record additional documents. She wanted to place on record following documents:-

- (i) Judgment given by the learned Family Court, Gautam Budh Nagar, UP in *HMA No. 578/2015*, whereby the petition filed by the petitioner herein has been dismissed.



(ii) The envelope, which purported to contain a legal notice dated 15.10.2024. (According to her, she had, merely, received blank papers in the aforesaid envelope and there was no notice as such.)

5. Learned counsel for petitioner does not dispute that he had filed the aforesaid petition at Gautam Budh Nagar, and by virtue of the aforesaid petition, the petitioner was seeking nullity of the marriage in question and, in alternate, had sought divorce.

6. The aforesaid judgment given by the learned Judge, Family Court, Gautam Budh Nagar, has apparently some bearing over the suit in question though according to learned counsel for petitioner, such judgment has already been challenged by filing a *Matrimonial Appeal* before the Hon'ble Allahabad High Court.

7. With respect to the legal notice, this Court has seen the averments made in Para-13 of the plaint and the corresponding reply given by the defendant. The defendant herself, at the first available opportunity, mentioned in such written statement/reply that she had received envelope, but such envelope was containing blank papers only. Thus, the aforesaid envelope also does not introduce any new thing and does not, even, run contrary to her pleadings.

8. Having heard the learned counsel for petitioner and on perusal of record, this Court does not find any element of illegality or perversity in the impugned order. Rather, keeping in mind the nature of the suit filed by the plaintiff/petitioner herein, these documents seem relevant for resolution of the controversy in question and would enable the learned Trial Court to reach just and fair decision in the matter and, therefore, this Court does not find any necessity to interfere with the impugned order dated 18.01.2025.



2025 :DHC :2890



9. Revision petition is accordingly dismissed.
10. Pending application, if any, is also disposed of.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

APRIL 23, 2025/dr/shs