



\$~60to63,70to72, 74 and 79

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

% *Date of Decision: 26th May, 2025*

+ CM(M) 982/2025 & CM APPL. 32637-32639/2025

DEEPAK MOWARPetitioner

Through: Mr. Abhishek Bharti with Mr. Rishabh
Nigam, Advocates.

versus

HARVINDER SINGH SAHOTARespondent

Through: Mr. Gobind Malhotra with Mr. Lovish
Sharma , Mr. Rehan, Mr. Gurpeet
Singh and Ms. Namrata Malhotra,
Advocates.

61

+ CM(M) 983/2025 & CM APPL. 32681-32683/2025

DEEPAK MOWARPetitioner

Through: Mr. Abhishek Bharti with Mr. Rishabh
Nigam, Advocates.

versus

PARAMJIT SINGH NEOTERespondent

Through: Mr. Gobind Malhotra with Mr. Lovish
Sharma, Mr. Rehan, Mr. Gurpeet
Singh and Ms. Namrata Malhotra,
Advocates.

62

+ CM(M) 984/2025 & CM APPL. 32684-32686/2025

DEEPAK MOWARPetitioner

Through: Mr. Abhishek Bharti with Mr. Rishabh
Nigam, Advocates.

versus

BALWANT SINGHRespondent

Through: Mr. Gobind Malhotra with Mr. Lovish
Sharma , Mr. Rehan, Mr. Gurpeet
Singh and Ms. Namrata Malhotra,
Advocates.



63

+ CM(M) 985/2025 & CM APPL. 32689-32691/2025
DEEPAK MOWAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhishek Bharti with Mr. Rishabh
Nigam, Advocates

versus

RAJINDER SINGH

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Gobind Malhotra with Mr. Lovish
Sharma , Mr. Rehan, Mr. Gurpeet
Singh and Ms. Namrata Malhotra,
Advocates.

70

+ CM(M) 992/2025 & CM APPL. 32756-32758/2025
DEEPAK MOWAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhishek Bharti with Mr. Rishabh
Nigam, Advocates.

versus

KULVINDER SINGH SAHOTA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Gobind Malhotra with Mr. Lovish
Sharma , Mr. Rehan, Mr. Gurpeet
Singh and Ms. Namrata Malhotra,
Advocates.

71

+ CM(M) 993/2025 & CM APPL. 32951-32953/2025
DEEPAK MOWAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhishek Bharti with Mr. Rishabh
Nigam, Advocates.

versus

PARAMJIT SINGH NEOTE

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Gobind Malhotra with Mr. Lovish
Sharma , Mr. Rehan, Mr. Gurpeet
Singh and Ms. Namrata Malhotra,
Advocates.

72

+ CM(M) 994/2025 & CM APPL. 32760-32762/2025
DEEPAK MOWAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhishek Bharti with Mr. Rishabh
Nigam, Advocates.



- 74
+ versus
ARCHANA SINGH & ORS.Respondent
Through: None.
- CM(M) 996/2025 & CM APPL. 32765-32767/2025
DEEPAK MOWARPetitioner
Through: Mr. Abhishek Bharti with Mr. Rishabh Nigam, Advocates.
- versus
JASWANT KAURRespondent
Through: Mr. Gobind Malhotra with Mr. Lovish Sharma , Mr. Rehan, Mr. Gurpeet Singh and Ms. Namrata Malhotra, Advocates.
- 79
+ CM(M) 1001/2025 & CM APPL. 32853-32856/2025
DEEPAK MOWARPetitioner
Through: Mr. Abhishek Bharti with Mr. Rishabh Nigam, Advocates.
- versus
JOGINDER SINGHRespondent
Through: Mr. Gobind Malhotra with Mr. Lovish Sharma , Mr. Rehan, Mr. Gurpeet Singh and Ms. Namrata Malhotra, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. The issue raised in all the nine present petitions is, more or less, similar.
2. The petitioner is aggrieved by the order whereby learned District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, New Delhi has issued *non-bailable warrants* against him in different matters.
3. It is submitted by learned counsel for petitioner that there is no intention to run away from the execution proceedings but according to him,



the complaint was, merely, against the Company of which the Judgment Debtor was stated to be a Director at one point of time. He submits that even the execution petition had been filed against JD Company only and it was only during the proceedings of the case, relying upon general directions given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Periyammal v. V. Rajamani, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 507*, the learned District Commission has chosen to issue *non-bailable warrants*, without any advance notice.

4. It is informed that the abovesaid orders, whereby warrants were issued against the petitioner, were challenged by the petitioner by filing appeals and such appeals were taken up by the learned State Commission on 13.05.2025. Though, notice has been issued to the opposite side, there is no reference with respect to the urgent relief sought by the appellant whereby it requested for stay of *non-bailable warrants*.

5. It is submitted that all such appeals, have been adjourned by the learned State Commission for 27.08.2025 and if, in the interregnum, the petitioners are arrested, pursuant to execution of *non-bailable warrants*, all such appeals would render infructuous.

6. The Court has gone through the order dated 13.05.2025 and it appears that perhaps the urgency was not appropriately cited before the learned State Commission.

7. Since the appeals have already been preferred before the learned State Commission, it will be appropriate for the petitioner to seek appropriate remedy before the learned Appellate Commission.

8. Mr. Malhotra, learned counsel for respondents, appears in all matters (except CM(M) 994/2025).

9. In all fairness, he also submits that he would not take any step for the



purposes of collection of such NBWs from the learned District Commission for a period of three days from today.

10. During course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner sought liberty to move application(s) before learned State Commission, seeking early hearing for the purposes of consideration of the abovesaid relief regarding stay/recall of the warrants, within two days from today.

11. In view of the above, the petitions are disposed of with liberty to petitioner to move appropriate applications seeking early hearing and urgent relief before learned State Commission.

12. Let any such application be moved within two days from today, in all such appeals. The details of such matters are as under:-

ITEM NO.	DATE OF ORDER OF DISTRICT COMMISSION	E.A. NO. (Before District Commission)	DATE OF ORDER OF STATE COMMISSION	E.A. NO. (Before State Commission)
60	16.04.2025	EA/142/2023	13.05.2025	EA-32/25
61	16.04.2025	EA/144/2023	13.05.2025	EA-31/25
62	16.04.2025	EA/40/2023	13.05.2025	EA-30/25
63	16.04.2025	EA/39/2023	13.05.2025	EA-34/25
70	16.04.2025	EA/143/2023	13.05.2025	EA-33/25
71	16.04.2025	EA/145/2023	13.05.2025	EA-27/25
72	09.04.2025	EA/79/2023	13.05.2025	EA-26/25
74	16.04.2025	EA/41/2023	13.05.2025	EA-28/25
79	16.04.2025	EA/128/2023	13.05.2025	EA-35/25

13. The warrants in question be kept in abeyance for a period of three days to be reckoned from today.



2025:DHC:4410



14. It is, however, clarified that this court has not expressed any opinion with respect to the order passed by learned District Commission and it will be entirely up to the learned State Commission, where the abovesaid appeals are pending adjudication, to take appropriate decision. However, keeping in mind the nature of the urgency involved, this Court expects that, as and when, any such application is moved, the learned State Commission takes up the same and deals with the same in accordance with law.

15. All the petitions stand disposed of in aforesaid terms.

16. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

17. Order *dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

MAY 26, 2025/ sw/SS