

\$~26

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CM(M) 424/2016**
ATMA RAM TRUST

..... Petitioner
Through Mr.Amit Sethi and Mr. Ishan Khanna,
Advocates.

versus

**SHRI SANATAN DHARAM SABHA RAWAL PINDI (REGD) &
ORS**
..... Respondents
Through Nemo.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER
% **03.05.2016**

C.M. No.16187/2016 (exemption)

Exemption is allowed subject to just exceptions. Application disposed of.

CM(M) 424/2016 & C.M. No.16188/2016 (stay)

Petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 02.4.2016 vide which the application filed by the defendant under Order XVIII Rule 17 of the CPC had been allowed.

Submission is that the Court while passing order has noted the detailed reason as to how and in what circumstances the prayer made by the non-applicant had been allowed especially in view of the fact that the evidence of the plaintiff stood closed as way back as on 07.8.2015.

The impugned order has granted permission to the defendant/non-applicant to cross-examine PW-1 (already cross-examined for 4-5 times as is evident from the record) as also to lead evidence in defence.

After certain detailed arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he would not be pressing this petition on merits but he apprehends that there will be a delay in trial; as such seeks expedition in the progress of the case.

Noting the above factual matrix as also the submission noted supra which are borne out from the record, this Court is of the view that the Trial Court shall endeavour to conclude the evidence as expeditiously as possibility preferably within an outer limit of three months from the receipt of this Order.

With these directions, petition disposed of.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

MAY 03, 2016

ndn