



2026:UHC:1094

Judgment Reserved on: 13.02.2026

Judgment Delivered on: 18.02.2026

HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SUBHASH UPADHYAY

CIVIL REVISION NO.129 OF 2025

Pratibha Devi and Others

...Revisionists

Versus

Gaurav Jain and Another

...Respondents.

Counsel for the revisionists	:	Mr. Piyush Garg, learned counsel
Counsel for the respondents	:	Mr. Siddhartha Singh, learned counsel and Mr. Nikhil Singhal (through V.C.), learned counsel.

JUDGMENT: (per Mr. Subhash Upadhyay, J.)

This civil revision is directed against the order dated 16.10.2025 passed by the learned Judge SCC/1st Additional District Judge, Haridwar in SCC Suit No.06 of 2024, "Gaurav Jain & Anr. Vs. Smt. Partibha Devi & Ors.",

2. The revisionists have assailed the aforesaid order by which the application under Order 15 Rule 5 CPC of the respondents was allowed and the defense of the revisionists was struck off.

3. The factual matrix of the case is that, the respondents herein (plaintiffs in the suit) filed the suit under the Provincial Small Cause Courts Act against the revisionists (respondents in the suit) seeking a relief of eviction, arrears of rent and damages. The respondents claimed that their property – The Hotel Grand Lajja was given on rent to the revisionists initially at the rent of ₹6 lakh per month and 18%



GST and the tenancy started from 07.10.2021 and the rent was to be paid on the 10th day of every month.

4. As per the case of the respondents/plaintiffs, from October, 2023 the rent was to be enhanced and from the said date the rent payable was ₹8 lakh per month and 18% GST. As per the respondents/plaintiffs, rent since September, 2023 was not paid and only 50% of the GST amount was paid since 31.08.2023 and as such the revisionist was defaulter. A suit for eviction, arrears of rent and damages was thus filed, which was registered as Suit No.6 of 2024.

5. The revisionists / respondents filed their written statement on 03.04.2025 and did not dispute the relationship of tenant-landlord, however, disputed the amount payable towards arrears of rent on various grounds. The application filed by the respondents/plaintiffs under Order 15 Rule 5 CPC was considered and decided on 16.10.2025 striking off the defense of the revisionists / respondents against which the present revision has been preferred.

6. Learned counsel for the revisionists submits that as per the case of the revisionists the rent from July, 2025 was only payable to the respondents. Though the rent of July, 2025 amounting to ₹8 lakh was paid with some delay, however, the rent for the month of August and September, 2025 only could not be paid. The reasons for the delay was *bonafide* as negotiations were being held between the parties



for which he refers to the order-sheet to contend that as talks were going on between the parties as such the rent was not paid.

7. Learned counsel for the revisionists refers to the various judgments, namely, Asha Rani Gupta Vs. Vineet Kumar (2023) 20 SCC 273, Mangat Singh Trilochan Singh Vs. Satpal (2003) 8 SCC 357, Bimal Chand Jain Vs. Sri Gopal Agarwal (1981) 3 SCC 486 and Mukesh Verma and Anr. Vs. Sushant Misra ALL. High Court in Writ Petition No.1662 of 2018. On the basis of the said judgments, learned counsel for the revisionists contends that the word 'may' in Sub-rule (1) of Order 15 Rule 5 CPC merely vests power in the Court to strike off the defense and it is not oblige it to do so in every case of default.

8. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents /plaintiffs contends that the revisionist is a willful defaulter as neither the arrears of rent nor the rent of ₹8 lakh per month was deposited before the Trial Court. He further disputed that amount of ₹60 lakh was spent by the revisionists on the rented property.

9. He further submits that contention of the revisionists that rent was not paid on monthly basis as talks were going on between the parties for amicable settlement is an afterthought as no such ground was ever taken by the revisionists before the Trial Court. He further submits that, as



per Order 15 Rule 5 CPC, the rent is to be deposited per month and in case of any default representation can be filed showing *bonafide* for not depositing the said rent. He refers to the stand taken by the revisionists/respondents before the Trial Court wherein despite depositing the rent of ₹8 lakh for the month of July, 2025 again the revisionists/respondents disputed the said rent and as such he submits that once the revisionists admitted in the written statement and the objection filed in response to the application to Order 15 Rule 5 CPC, the admitted rent to be ₹8 lakh then the action of the revisionists in disputing the said admitted rent once again was a deliberate act of default without any justifiable reason.

10. Learned counsel for the respondents has also relied on the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Asha Rani Gupta Vs. Vineet Kumar (2023) 20 SCC 273** and contends that Order 15 Rule 5 CPC embodies the fundamental principle that there is no holidaying for a tenant in payment of rent or damages for use and occupation.

11. The question which falls for determination in the present revision is that as to whether learned Trial Court, on the basis of material available on record, was justified in striking off the defense of the revisionists and in holding that the approach of the revisionists in not depositing the due rent on monthly basis was an approach of defiance or volitional / elective non-performance.



12. There is no dispute between the parties on tenant-landlord relationship, however, the revisionist disputes the arrears of rent payable to the respondents and also contends that the entire property was not rented to him and he spent huge amount in construction which was adjusted towards the arrears of rent.

13. So far as the rent payable to the respondents/plaintiffs from October, 2023 @ ₹8 lakh per month is concerned, the revisionists in their written statement filed on 03.04.2025 made the following statement in paragraph no.17 to 19, which reads as under:

“17 (सत्रह)– यह कि दिनांक 01.10.2021 (एक अक्टूबर दो हजार इक्कीस) से दिनांक 30.09.2023 (तीस सितम्बर दो हजार तेईस) तक कुल चौबीस माह बनते हैं, जिसमें से छः माह का किराया माफ होने योग्य है और कुल अठारह माह का किराया छः लाख रुपये की दर से कुल सम्पत्ति का (जबकि कुल सम्पत्ति को वादग्रस्त सम्पत्ति में शामिल नहीं किया गया।) एक करोड़ आठ लाख रुपये बनता है तथा दिनांक 01.10.2023 (एक अक्टूबर दो हजार तेईस) से दिनांक 31.03.2025 (इकतीस मार्च दो हजार पच्चीस) तक कुल 18 (अठारह) माह जिसमें से दिनांक 26.12.2023 (छब्बीस दिसम्बर दो हजार तेईस) से दिनांक 23.09.2024 (तेईस सितम्बर दो हजार चौबीस) तक कुल 9 (नौ) माह का किराया विद्युत सप्लाई बाधित होने के कारण वादी प्राप्त करने का अधिकारी नहीं है, केवल नौ माह का किराया 8 (आठ) लाख रुपये प्रतिमाह मय टैक्स 72 (बहात्तर) लाख रुपये बनता है।

18 (अठारह)– यह कि प्रतिवादनी द्वारा अगस्त 2023 (दो हजार तेईस) तक वादी को मुबं 1,44,00,000/– (एक करोड़ चव्वालीस लाख) रुपये अदा कर चुके हैं तथा मुबं 60,00,000/– (साठ लाख) रुपये प्रतिवादनी द्वारा जो कार्य प्रश्नगत सम्पत्ति में कराये जो कि उपरोक्त पैरा में स्पष्ट किया गया है, में खर्च किया, इस प्रकार वादी मुबं 2,04,00,000/– (दो करोड़ चार लाख) रुपये का भुगतान कर चुकी है। जबकि केवल मुबं 1,80,00,000/– (एक करोड़ अस्सी लाख) रुपये ही वादी के दिनांक 31.03.2025 (इकतीस मार्च दो हजार पच्चीस) तक बनते हैं। इस प्रकार प्रतिवादनी के वादी की ओर मुबं 24,00,000/– (चौबीस लाख) अग्रिम धनराशि किराये के रूप में जमा चले आ रहे हैं। यहां यह विशेष रूप से उल्लेखनीय है कि वादी द्वारा पूर्व में किराया बैंक में किश्त जमा करने के कारण अपनी मजबूरी जाहिर करके प्रतिवादनी से प्राप्त किया था और अग्रिम किराये में समायोजित करने की बात कही गयी थी तथा जो मुबं 60,00,000/– (साठ लाख) रुपये किराये में समायोजित करने की बात हुई थी, जब प्रतिवादनी द्वारा वादी को हिसाब करने और पूर्व में जो धनराशि प्राप्त की जो प्रतिवादनी द्वारा 60 (साठ) लाख रुपये खर्च किये उसको समायोजित करने या भुगतान करने के लिए कहा तो वादी व उसके पिता नाराज



हो गये और प्रतिवादनी को धमकी देने लगे और प्रश्नगत सम्पत्ति से विद्युत कनेक्शन को विच्छेदित करा दिया, जिससे प्रतिवादनी का सारा काम ठप हो गया। प्रतिवादनी द्वारा न्यायालय में वाद दायर करके न्यायालय के आदेश से विद्युत विभाग से पुनः कनेक्शन प्राप्त किये जा रहे हैं।

19 (उन्नीस)– यह कि इस प्रकार प्रतिवादनी की ओर वादी का कोई किराया बकाया नहीं है बल्कि प्रतिवादनी के मुब० 24,00,000/– (चौबीस लाख) रुपये उपरोक्तानुसार वादी की ओर अग्रिम किराये के रूप में जमा चले आते हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में वादी का वाद कानूनन पोषणीय नहीं है और निरस्त होने योग्य है।”

14. Further, in reply to the application filed by the respondents under Order 15 Rule 5 CPC, the revisionists in their objections dated 26.05.2025 made the following averments in paragraph no.7, which reads as under:

“7. यह कि प्रतिवादनी अगस्त 2023 तक वादी को मुब० 1,44,00,000/– रुपये अदा कर चुकी है तथा मुब० 60,00,000/– रुपये प्रतिवादनी द्वारा जो कार्य प्रश्नगत सम्पत्ति में कराये जिन्हे उत्तरपत्र के पैरा सं० 9 में उल्लेखित किया है, में खर्च किया है, इस प्रकार प्रतिवादनी कुल मुब० 2,04,00,000/– रुपये अदा कर चुकी है। जबकि दिनांक 31.03.2025 तक वादी के केवल मुब० 1,80,00,000/– रुपये ही बनते थे। इस प्रकार प्रतिवादनी के वादी की ओर मुब० 24,00,000/– अग्रिम धनराशि किराये के रूप में जमा चली आती है, जो कि जून 2025 तक के किराये के रूप में जमा है। इस प्रकार प्रतिवादनी की ओर कोई किराया बकाया नहीं है। जिस कारण वादी का प्रार्थनापत्र अन्तर्गत आदेश 15 नियम 5 निरस्त होने योग्य है।”

15. Admittedly, no representation was submitted by the revisionists before the Trial Court, as provided under Rule 5 of Order 15 CPC, either within ten days of the first hearing or of the expiry of the week referred to in the Sub-section (1) as the case may be. Order 15 Rule 5 CPC reads as under:

“5. Striking off defence for failure to deposit admitted rent.—(1) In any suit by a lessor for the eviction of a lessee after the determination of his lease and for the recovery from him of rent or compensation for use and occupation, the defendant shall, at or before the first hearing of the suit, deposit the entire amount admitted by him to be due together with interest thereon at the rate of nine per cent. per annum and whether or not he admits any amount to be due, he shall throughout the continuation of the suit regularly deposit the monthly amount due within a week from the date of its accrual, and in the event of any default in



making the deposit of the entire amount admitted by him to be due or the monthly amount due as aforesaid, the Court may, subject to the provisions of sub-rule (2) strike off his defence.

Explanation 1—The expression "first hearing" means the date for filing written statement for hearing mentioned in the summons or where more than one of such dates are mentioned, the last of the dates mentioned.

Explanation 2—The expression "entire amount admitted by him to be due" means the entire gross amount, whether as rent or compensation for use and occupation, calculated at the admitted rate of rent for the admitted period of arrears after making no other deduction except the taxes, if any, paid to a local authority in respect of the building on lessor's account "[and the amount, if any, paid to the lessor acknowledged by the lessor in writing signed by him] and the amount, if any, deposited in any Court under section 30 of the U.P. Urban Buildings (Regulation of Letting, Rent and Eviction) Act, 1972.

Explanation 3—(1) The expression "monthly amount due" means the amount due every month, whether as rent or compensation for use and occupation at the admitted rate of rent, after making no other deduction except the taxes, if any, paid to a local authority, in respect of the building on lessor's account.

(2) Before making an order for striking off defence, the Court may consider any representation made by the defendant in that behalf provided such representation is made within 10 days of the first hearing or, of the expiry of the week referred to in sub-section (1), as the case may be.

(3) The amount deposited under this rule may at any time be withdrawn by the plaintiff

Provided that such withdrawal shall not have the effect of prejudicing any claim by the plaintiff disputing the correctness of the amount deposited:

Provided further that if the amount deposited includes any sums claimed by the depositor to be



deductible on any account, the Court may require the plaintiff to furnish the security for such sum before he is allowed to withdraw the same."

16. The stand taken by the revisionists / respondents before the learned Trial Court is that as he is not in a possession of the entire rented accommodation as such rent of ₹8 lakh was not payable to the respondents and the same cannot be deposited before the Court below.

17. Paragraph no.12 and 16 of the order under challenge wherein the said discussion has been made reads as under:

"12. प्रतिवादी के द्वारा इस सम्बन्ध में यह तर्क दिया गया कि वादी द्वारा उसे प्रश्नगत सम्पत्ति जो कि वादपत्र में अपूर्ण दर्शित की गयी है, का 6 लाख रुपये प्रतिमाह जो कि आगे बढ़कर 8 लाख रुपये प्रतिमाह किरायेदार होना बताया गया है, तथा इस सम्पत्ति के शेष भाग के बाबत उसे अवैध कब्जेदार होना बताते हुए एक अन्य मूलवाद सं० 273/2023 योजित किया है, जबकि वह सम्पूर्ण सम्पत्ति जो कि 16 बीघे चली आती है, का किरायेदार है और इस 16 बीघे की सम्पत्ति का कुल किराया 6 लाख रुपये था जो बाद में बढ़कर 8 लाख रुपये होना तय हुआ था। तब वह किस प्रकार अपूर्ण सम्पत्ति का किराया 8 लाख रुपये न्यायालय में जमा करे अथवा वादी को अदा करे। इस पर न्यायालय स्पष्ट करना आवश्यक पाती है कि इसी सम्पत्ति पर बने एक अन्यत्र कमरे ६ सम्पत्ति के बाबत पक्षों के मध्य एक अन्य एग्रीमेंट किरायेदारी बाबत लिखा गया, जिसका भी एक खफीफा वाद संख्या 01/2024 इस न्यायालय में लम्बित है। ऐसे में यह अभी साक्ष्य का विषय है कि वादी ने किरायेदारी में जो सम्पत्ति 16 बीघे अपने एग्रीमेंट में किराये पर देने बाबत लिखी है उसमें कौन कौन सी निर्मित सम्पत्ति और खाली स्थान प्रतिवादीगण को इस वादपत्र में दाखिल एग्रीमेंट के अनुसार दिया गया था, क्योंकि इसी सम्पत्ति के एक कमरे को बाद में वादी ने प्रतिवादीगण को अलग से किराये पर दिया। ऐसे में पक्षों के मध्य कई वाद चल रहे हैं तथा यह बिन्दु कि वादी द्वारा कितनी सम्पत्ति और उसमें बने कितने निर्माण व खाली स्थान को वादी ने, प्रतिवादीगण को किराये पर दिया था और कितनी सम्पत्ति को उस 16 बीघे की सम्पत्ति में से, अपने पास रखा था, साक्ष्य का विषय हो जाता है जो कि वादी को सर्वप्रथम स्वयं ही सिद्ध करना होगा। ऐसे में जबकि प्रतिवादीगण स्वयं इस बात को स्वीकारता है कि प्रश्नगत सम्पत्ति जो कि उसके पास 16बीघे के रूप में मौजूद चली आती है जिसमें होटल, बैंकेंट हॉल व खुला लॉन सम्मिलित है, तब उसकी जिम्मेदारी है कि वह जब से वह इस बात को स्वीकारता है कि उस पर इस सम्पत्ति का किराया बकाया चला आता है अथवा वाजिब होता है, वह उक्त अवधि का किराया नियमानुसार न्यायालय ६ वादी को देता रहे, लेकिन प्रतिवादी द्वारा ऐसा नहीं किया गया, जोकि प्रतिवादीगण के भाग में चूक को दर्शित करता है। एक वाद प्रतिवादीगण द्वारा मात्र एक बार 8 लाख रुपये जमा किया गया तथा उसके उपरांत से प्रतिवादीगण द्वारा कोई भी किराया अदा न करना तथा पहली बार भी समय अवधि के उपरांत किराया अदा करना प्रतिवादी के भाग में जानबूझकर की जा रही लापरवाही / चूक को प्रदर्शित करता है तथा यहां पर एक बार वादी के कथनानुसार 8 लाख रुपये माहवार किराया मानकर स्वीकार कर लेना और फिर पुनः किराया अदा ना करना, यह प्रदर्शित करता है कि प्रतिवादी ना तो सम्पत्ति को खाली करने के पक्ष में है और ना ही सम्पत्ति का किराया अदा करने को तैयार है जबकि उसे प्रतिमाह इस सम्पत्ति का किराया नियमानुसार समय पर अदा करना चाहिए। यहां



पर यह तथ्य भी महत्वपूर्ण है कि जब प्रतिवादी इस बात को स्वीकारते हैं कि उन्होंने एक एग्रीमेंट के तहत प्रश्नगत सम्पत्ति के बाबत एक किरायानामा वादी के साथ लिखकर तय किया, तब वह 8 लाख रुपये का किराया सम्पूर्ण 16 बीघे और उस पर बनी सम्पत्ति के बाबत है, या अलग अलग सम्पत्ति के बाबत, यह साक्ष्य का विषय है। लेकिन प्रतिवादीगण सम्पत्ति पर काबिज हैं व सम्पत्ति का उपयोग व उपभोग कर रहे और स्वयं इस तथ्य को स्वीकारते हैं कि सम्पूर्ण सम्पत्ति का किराया पहले 6 लाख रुपये व फिर 8 लाख रुपये माहवार तय हुआ था, जिससे प्रतिवादीगण को अपने स्वीकृत कथनों के आधार वादी को प्रतिमाह किराया अदा करना आवश्यक है, जोकि उसके द्वारा नहीं किया जा रहा है। ऐसे में पुनः यह प्रतिवादीगण के भाग में जानबूझकर की जा रही चूक है।

16. ऐसे में उपरोक्त नजीरों एवं प्रावधानों के आलोक में व न्यायालय द्वारा जो पूर्व में पक्षों के कथनों पर विवेचन कर मत दिया गया, के उपरांत न्यायालय इस मत की है कि प्रतिवादीगण द्वारा सम्पत्ति का उपयोग व उपभोग करने के उपरांत भी प्रत्येक माह का किराया तक वादी को अदा नहीं किया जा रहा है, जबकि उसे समस्त किराया जो कि वह स्वीकारता है, को वाद की सुनवाई की प्रथम तिथि को न्यायालय में जमा करना चाहिए था या वादी को अदा करना चाहिए था, लेकिन उसके द्वारा केवल एक बार एक माह का किराया 8 लाख रुपये मात्र जमा किया गया जोकि समय अवधि निकलने के बाद जमा किया गया तथा उसके उपरांत से भी उस पर आज तक दो माह का किराया वाजिब हो चला है, जोकि वह स्वयं स्वीकारता है, जिसे उसके द्वारा न तो वादी को अदा किया जा रहा है और न ही न्यायालय में जमा किया जा रहा है, तब प्रतिवादीगण का प्रतिरक्षा का अवसर आदेश 15 नियम 5 दीवानी प्रक्रिया संहिता के तहत समाप्त किया जाना यह न्यायालय पाती है तथा प्रतिवादीगण के कृत्यों को देखते हुए उसके द्वारा दाखिल नजीरों का कोई लाभ उसे नहीं दिया जा सकता है। तदनुसार वादी का प्रार्थना पत्र 23ग स्वीकार किये जाने योग्य है।”

18. The learned Trial Court took cognizance of the stand taken by the revisionists in their written statement and the objection filed to the application Under Order 15 Rule 5 CPC and, on the basis of the aforesaid material, came to the conclusion that the revisionist, who had himself admitted rent to be ₹8 lakh per month and who had, in fact, deposited once the said rent of ₹8 lakh in the month of July belatedly before the Trial Court was unjustified in disputing the aforesaid monthly payable rent and the said approach of the revisionists was of elective non-performance.

19. The Court has also perused material available on record and the discretion exercised by the learned Trial Court in coming to the said conclusion cannot be faulted. The Court has also perused the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court



in the case of **Asha Rani Gupta (*supra*)** in which it was held that in case of deliberate defiance or volitional / elective non-performance, the consequence of law remains inevitable, that the defence of such a defendant would be struck off. Paragraph nos. 38, 39, 40 and 46 of the aforesaid judgment are extracted hereunder:

“38. Reverting to the provisions under consideration, it is noticed that while the first part of sub-rule (1) of Rule 5 Order 15CPC requires deposit of the admitted due amount of rent together with interest, the second part thereof mandates that whether or not the tenant admits the amount to be due, he has to, throughout the continuation of the suit, regularly deposit monthly amount due within a week from the date of its accrual. Read as a whole, it is but clear that Order 15 Rule 5CPC embodies the fundamental principle that there is no holidaying for a tenant in payment of rent or damages for use and occupation, whether the lease is subsisting or it has been determined. The only basic requirement in the suit of the nature envisaged by Order 15 Rule 5CPC is the character of the defendant as being the lessee/tenant in the suit premises. Viewed from this angle, we are not inclined to accept the line of thought in some of the decisions of the High Court that in every case of denial of relationship of landlord and tenant, the defendant in suit for eviction and recovery of rent/damages could enjoy holidays as regards payment of rent.

39. For what has been discussed hereinabove, the decision of the High Court in Ladly Prasad [Ladly Prasad v. Ram Shah Billa, 1975 SCC OnLine All 294 : (1976) 2 ALR 8] does not require much dilation when it remains indisputable that it is not always obligatory on the court to strike off the defence. However, the said decision cannot be read to mean that despite default of the tenant in payment of rent, the defence has to be permitted irrespective of its baselessness. The decision in Kunwar Baldevji [Kunwar Baldevji v. Addl. District Judge, Bulandshahar, 2003 SCC OnLine All 311 : (2003) 1 ARC 637] , again, would have no application to the



facts of the present case. Herein, the respondent-defendant has not only omitted to deposit the rent on the first date of the hearing but, has also omitted to deposit the accrued rent during the pendency of the suit.

40. In a suit of the present nature, where the defendant otherwise has not denied his status as being the lessee, it was rather imperative for him to have scrupulously complied with the requirements of law and to have deposited the arrears of rent due together with interest on or before the first date of hearing and in any case, as per the second part of sub-rule (1) of Rule 5 Order 15CPC, he was under the specific obligation to make regular deposit of the monthly amount due, whether he was admitting any such dues or not.

46. With respect, the said conclusion of the High Court could only be said to be an assumptive one, being not supported by any reason. In para 43, of course, the High Court observed with reference to the decisions of this Court that the discretionary power must be exercised with great circumspection but, such enunciation by this Court cannot be read to mean that whatever may be the fault and want of bona fide in the defendant/tenant, he would be readily given the so-called "indulgence" of not striking off defence. Such an approach is neither envisaged by the statutory provisions nor by the referred decisions. In fact, such an approach would simply render the relevant provisions of law rather nugatory. The expected circumspection would require the Court to be cautious of all the relevant facts and the material on record and not to strike off the defence as a matter of routine. However, when a case of the present nature is before the Court, disclosing deliberate defiance and volitional/elective non-performance, the consequence of law remains inevitable, that the defence of such a defendant would be struck off."

20. In the present case, perusal of the written statement, objection to the application filed under Order 15 Rule 5 CPC and the stand of the revisionists before the Trial Court indicates that despite admitting the rent to be ₹8 lakh



per month and despite an admission on the part of the revisionists that rent of ₹8 lakh was payable from July, 2025, the revisionists deliberately on its own volition failed to deposit rent on monthly basis.

21. This Court under the revisional jurisdiction can interfere in the order passed by the learned Trial Court, in case, the said findings are totally perverse or any order is passed without jurisdiction. In the present case, the learned Trial Court has given cogent reasons while exercising its discretionary power to struck off defense after going through the entire material available on record and after considering the facts of the case.

22. In view of the above discussion, this Court do not find any merit in the present revision and is not inclined to take any view different than the view taken by the learned Trial Court. Thus, the revision fails and is hereby dismissed at the admission stage itself.

23. As a sequel thereto, the miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

Dt:18.02.2026

Sukhbant

**SUKHBANT
SINGH**

SUBHASH UPADHYAY, J.

 Digitally signed by SUKHBANT SINGH
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND, ou=HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND,
2.5.4.20=71978f9c61bfde0ba69967c787b1764ea7bc7dd129a8a6380
d49b1885e628615, postalCode=263001, st=UTTARAKHAND,
serialNumber=2D8B71B8D8E345F6B7F95B1DD4FB48EBD2B7D72C4
2261361AED33172F152148D, cn=SUKHBANT SINGH
Date: 2026.02.18 16:35:07 +05'30'