

\$~52

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

%

Judgment delivered on: 16.09.2019

+ C.R.P. 207/2019

SUDESH ARORA

..... Petitioner

versus

JAGDISH RAJ SAGAR

..... Respondent

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner: Mr.Anurag Ojha, Adv.

For the Respondent: None.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

CM APPL. 41386/2019 (Exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

C.R.P. 207/2019 & CM APPL.41385/2019 & 41387/2019

1. Petitioner impugns order dated 29.01.2019 whereby an application filed by the respondent under Order 8 Rule 1A(3) CPC seeking to place on record certain additional documents has been allowed with cost of Rs.5000/-.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that by the application respondent has substantially delayed the progress of the suit which was at the stage of final hearing and about one year passed in disposal of the

application.

3. By the application under Order 8 Rule 1A, the respondent has sought to place on record certified copies of orders/judgments in different proceedings.

4. Certified copy of a judgment/order of a Court is admissible in evidence under Section 74 read with Section 77 of the Indian Evidence Act without formal proof thereof.

5. Since the certified copy of a judgment/order of a Court is admissible in evidence, respondent could have even produced the same at the time of addressing arguments. No formal application under Order 8 Rule 1A was required to be filed by the respondent.

6. In so far as the contention of learned counsel for the petitioner with regard to delay is concerned, it is seen that the application has been allowed with costs to compensate the petitioner for the delay.

7. Imposition of costs and the quantum of costs is a discretionary order and does not warrant any interference by the Court.

8. In view of the above, I do not find any merit in the petition.

9. Petition is accordingly dismissed.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

SEPTEMBER 16, 2019

rk