



2026:DHC:764



\$~46

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

*Date of Decision: 30<sup>th</sup> January, 2026*

+ CM(M) 235/2026

SATISH KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhinav Sharma and Ms. Gurjot  
Sethi, Advocates.

versus

MAYAWATI (DECEASED THROUGH LRS) AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: None.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJNEESH KUMAR GUPTA**

**ORDER (Oral)**

**Rajneesh Kumar Gupta, J.**

1. This hearing has been conducted through hybrid mode.

**CM APPL. 6353/2026 (for condonation of delay)**

2. The present application has been filed by the petitioner seeking condonation of delay of 05 days in re-filing the present petition.

3. For the reasons stated in the application, the condonation of delay of 05 days is condoned and the application is disposed of.

**CM APPL. 6351/2026 & CM APPL. 6352/2026 (for exemptions)**

4. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions. Applications stand disposed of.

**CM(M) 235/2026 & CM APPL. 6350/2026 (for stay)**

5. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, 1950, assailing the orders dated 04<sup>th</sup> December, 2025, 02<sup>nd</sup> September, 2025 and 04<sup>th</sup> April, 2025, passed by the trial court in case bearing no. CS SCJ 95959/16.



2026:DHC:764



6. Heard. Record perused.
7. Learned Counsel for the petitioner/defendant no. 2 has argued that impugned order be set aside and petitioner be given one more opportunity to lead his complete evidence. The denial of this opportunity would cause grave injustice to the petitioner.
8. A perusal of the record shows that the evidence of the petitioner was earlier closed on 15<sup>th</sup> July, 2022. Thereafter, on the application moved by the petitioner, one more opportunity was again granted to the petitioner by the trial court. The case was fixed for the evidence of the petitioner in the year 2016 after the closing of the evidence of the respondent/plaintiff and since then, ample opportunities have been granted to the petitioner to lead his evidence. Keeping in view all these facts, this Court does not find any illegality in the impugned order, whereby the evidence of the petitioner has been rightly closed by the trial court.
9. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed as being devoid of any merit. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

**RAJNEESH KUMAR GUPTA, J**

**JANUARY 30, 2026/v/tp**