

\$~66

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

+ **FAO(OS) 69/2016**

RANA PRATAP SONI THR LRS Appellants
Through : Mr K.K.Rohtagi, Advocate.

versus

OM PRATAP SONI Respondent
Through : None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BADAR DURREZ AHMED

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

ORDER

% **08.03.2016**

CM No.8362/2016(exemption)

Exemption is allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

FAO(OS) 69/2016 & CM No.8361/2016

We have heard the learned counsel for the appellants.

The appeal is directed against the order dated 22.01.2016 passed by a learned Single Judge of this Court in O.A. No. 150/2014, which was a Chamber Appeal directed against the order dated 02.06.2014 passed by the Joint Registrar, whereby the application of Shri Om Pratap Soni (the respondent herein) filed under Order 7 Rule 14 CPC read with Order 8 Rule 1A was dismissed and the additional documents sought to be produced by him were not permitted to be taken on record.

The documents, which were sought to be placed on record, were all obtained from the record of the Land and Development Office and they purported to be certified copies of the said documents. The learned Single Judge, after examining the matter in detail and hearing counsel on both sides, came to the conclusion that the documents should be allowed to be produced. The learned Single Judge specifically noted that whether or not the respondent establishes the said documents in evidence was yet to be seen and the said consideration could

not be a reason to disallow the production of documents. The learned Single Judge also noted that no prejudice would be caused to the appellants since the documents have been produced while the matter is still pending trial. The source of the copies of the documents, being the Land and Development Office, also indicates that they were not produced from a doubtful source. Since delay was caused on account of the production of the said documents at a late stage, the learned Single Judge had directed that the appellants be compensated by awarding costs of Rs 10,000/-.

We see no reason to interfere with the impugned order. The appeal is dismissed.

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

MARCH 08, 2016
‘sn’