



2026:DHC:2525



\$~64

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

Date of Decision: 25th March, 2026

+ CM(M) 622/2026, CM APPL. 18886/2026, CM APPL. 18887/2026 &
CM APPL. 18888/2026

PARUL BAWA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Satish Kumar, Adv. (through VC)

versus

SH. MOHIT GANDHI

.....Respondents

Through: Advocate. (appearance not given)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJNEESH KUMAR GUPTA

ORDER (Oral)

Rajneesh Kumar Gupta, J.

1. This hearing has been conducted through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioner under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, 1950, assailing the order dated 12th February, 2026 passed by the learned Trial Court in Civil suit no. 224/2020, whereby the right of the petitioner/defendant no. 3 to lead defence evidence has been closed.
3. Learned Counsel for the respondents/plaintiff appeared on advance notice.
4. The matter is heard with the consent of learned Counsels for the parties. Record Perused.
5. Learned Counsel for the respondents has also placed on record the order sheets of the Trial Court, which are taken on record.
6. Learned Counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner be



2026:DHC:2525



given one more opportunity to lead her evidence, failing which she would suffer grave prejudice. It is stated that the Trial Court has closed the petitioner's evidence without affording adequate opportunities.

7. *Per Contra*, learned Counsel for the respondents has argued that sufficient opportunities had already been granted to the petitioner to lead her evidence, despite which she failed to do so. The present petition has been moved only to delay the trial and it be dismissed.

8. A perusal of the order sheets of the Trial Court shows that the matter was fixed for the petitioner's evidence for the first time on 03rd February, 2026 and thereafter on 22nd April, 2025, 19th May, 2025, 01st September, 2025, 13th October, 2025, 02nd December, 2025 and 19th January, 2026. *Vide* the impugned order dated 12th February, 2026, the right of the petitioner to lead evidence was closed.

9. From the record, it is evident that sufficient opportunities were granted to the petitioner to lead her evidence; however, the petitioner failed to avail the same and which has resulted in the delay of the trial. A perusal of the impugned order shows that the Trial Court has passed a well-reasoned order in accordance with law after taking into consideration the opportunities granted to the petitioner to lead her evidence. Accordingly, this Court does not find any infirmity in the impugned order and the same is upheld. The present petition is dismissed as being devoid of any merits. Pending application (s), if any, also stand disposed of.

RAJNEESH KUMAR GUPTA, J

MARCH 25, 2026/sds/tp