



\$~49

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CNR No. DLHC010405692026
+ C.R.P. 250/2026, CM APPL. 58296/2026, CM APPL.
58297/2026 & CM APPL. 58298/2026
GARIMA CHOPRA & ANR. Petitioners
Through: Ms. Mrinalini Sen, Advocate
(DHCLSC)

versus

MAYANK MANN Respondent
Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

% **31.08.2026**

1. This petition has been filed seeking setting aside of the order dated 16 April 2026 passed by the Trial Court, Rohini, in CS/SCJ/1412/2022 whereby the application filed by the petitioner/defendant under Order VII Rule 11 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (*'CPC'*), came to be dismissed.
2. The suit was filed by the plaintiff/respondent seeking recovery of Rs. 1,50,000/- along with interest, arising out of an agreement for providing financial consultancy and assistance entered into between the respondent/plaintiff and the husband of petitioner no.1, *Manish Chopra*/petitioner no.2.
3. Respondent/plaintiff stated that they had assisted *Manish Chopra* and the petitioner, *Ms. Garima Chopra*, in obtaining a loan from a financial institution and that, pursuant to such assistance, ultimately IIFL Home Finance Ltd. assured a sanctioned loan facility in favour of



defendants.

4. An agreement dated 27th December 2021 was entered into between plaintiff and defendants. Towards payment of consultancy fee and service charge, a post-dated cheque bearing *No. 059896* drawn on *YES Bank* for a sum of *Rs.1,50,000/-* was issued by petitioner to respondent/plaintiff for this purpose. The said cheque was dishonoured, pursuant to which the recovery suit was filed.

5. *Ms. Mrinalini Sen*, Legal Aid counsel appearing for the petitioner, states that the agreement was signed between respondent and husband of petitioner/*Manish Chopra* and not petitioner no.1 herself and, therefore, there was no cause of action against the petitioner.

6. This submission will not be tenable for the reason that the petitioner no.1 herself issued the cheque and plaintiff/respondent has made averments that both the husband and the wife had taken advantage of the financial assistance which was given to them on the basis of which they had promised to pay the plaintiff.

7. In this regard, the order passed rejecting the application filled under Order VII Rule 11 of CPC does not need to be interfered with; accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

8. Pending applications (if any) are rendered infructuous.

9. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

AUGUST 31, 2026/RK/bp