

4
\$~9 and 10

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

+ **FAO 600/2016 and C.M. No.47531/2016 (stay)**

SHALINI TAKKAR

..... Appellant

Through: Mr. Abdhesh Chaudhary, Advocate
with Mr. Yogesh Kumar Keshari,
Advocate and Mr. Shantanu
Majumdar, Advocate.

versus

RAJEEV SHARMA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Goswami, Advocate for
respondent Nos.2 to 6.

+ **FAO 603/2016 and C.M. No.47691/2016 (stay)**

PAWAN KUMAR PERIWAL

..... Appellant

Through: Mr. Abdhesh Chaudhary, Advocate
with Mr. Yogesh Kumar Keshari,
Advocate and Mr. Shantanu
Majumdar, Advocate.

versus

RAJEEV SHARMA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Goswami, Advocate for
respondent Nos.2 to 6.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VALMIKI J. MEHTA

ORDER

%

02.11.2017

1. After hearing counsels for the parties, it is noted that the subject

5

suits pertain to immovable properties and therefore Section 52 of the Transfer of Property Act, 1882 containing the doctrine of *lis pendens* will come into play in favour of the appellants/plaintiffs. Accordingly if there is any transfer of the suit properties by the defendants in the suits, then, the same will be subject to the doctrine of *lis pendens* contained in Section 52 of the Transfer of Property Act and the defendants, if they transfer their rights in the suit properties, then, they will intimate the plaintiffs on transferring the suit properties.

2. Nothing contained in today's order is a reflection on merits of the cases of either of the parties and which will be decided by the trial court in accordance with law. Impugned orders which are challenged in the appeals will accordingly stand subject to aforesaid observations.

3. Appeals are accordingly disposed of in terms of aforesaid observations.

NOVEMBER 02, 2017

Ne


VALMIKI J. MEHTA, J