



\$~18

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

CNR No. DLHC010120852025

+ **RFA 230/2025, CM APPL. 13789/2025, CM APPL. 13792/2025**

KULPREET SINGH OBEROI Appellant

Through: **Mr. Rajesh Kajla, Advocate**

versus

VIKRAM SOLANKI

.....Respondent

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

% **18.08.2026**

CM APPL. 13788/2025

1. Application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC) has been filed on behalf of the Appellant seeking condonation of delay of 621 days in filing the Appeal.
2. It is submitted that the impugned judgment and decree is dated 01.03.2023 against which the Appeal could have been preferred till 01.06.2023 and there is a delay of 621 days.
3. It is stated that the Appellant's father is about 80 years and has suffered from brain stroke in 2019 and he is also suffering from condition of Nocturnal Enuresis and urge incontinence. The Appellant is the only person to take care of his father and often has to take appointments from the hospital.
4. The Appellant's mother is a 74 years' old suffering from thyroid



issues and needs continuous medical care.

5. The wife of the Appellant Ms. Manjeet Kaur is also suffering from seizure and mental disorder and is in continuous need of care and attention. The Appellant has to be at home in continuous hours.

6. It is submitted that the Appellant has been taking care of his father, mother and wife for which reasons, he was heavily occupied and financially strained, making it difficult to avail the remedy.

7. Reliance is placed on Mool Chand v. Union of India and Anr. 2024 INSC 577 and N. Balakrishnan v. M. Krishnamurthy AIR 1998 SC 3222.

8. It is submitted that the delay is *bona fide* and the same may be condoned.

Submissions heard and record perused.

9. There is an inordinate delay of 621 days in filing the present Appeal. According to the Appellant, he was unable to file the Appeal on account of illness of his father, who suffered a brain stroke in 2019, but the impugned judgment came in 2023.

10. It is not an *ex parte* judgment and the Appellant had been throughout pursuing the same. Therefore, for him to say that he was continuously taking care of and was unable to file the Appeal, does not appeal to common sense.

11. Likewise, the ailment of mother is stated to be thyroid and it has not been explained as to what kind of continuous treatment for such ailment is required.

12. It has been conveniently stated that his wife is also suffering from seizures without giving any details.

13. Even if all the submissions made in the Application are admitted, then too, no *bona fide* and sufficient reasons have been given to explain the



inordinate delay of 621 days.

14. The Application is without any merits and is hereby dismissed. Consequently, the Appeal along with pending Applications, also stands dismissed.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J.

AUGUST 18, 2026

N