



\$~95

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CONT.CAS(C) 26/2025 & CM APPL. 1536/2025**
HITENDER SHOKEENPetitioner

Through: Mr. Bhuvneshar Tyagi, Advocate

versus

AMAL SINHARespondent
Through: Mr. Narender Hooda, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Rishab Raj Jain, Mr. Yuvraj
Nandal, Mr. Shiv Bhatnagar and Ms.
Pallavi Hooda, Advocates

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER
13.01.2025

%

1. This Court has seen order dated 09.08.2024 whereby the respondent company i.e. BSES-RPL were directed to process the refund security deposit and simultaneously petitioner was directed to submit an undertaking before BSES-RPL by way of an affidavit as required by the respondent in terms of Para-7 of their status report.
2. Learned counsel for petitioner, however, submits that respondent did not apprise the Court on 09.08.2024 that they had already adjusted the security amount by generating a bill on 01.08.2024.
3. According to learned counsel for petitioner, such adjustment is wrong and erroneous.
4. Learned counsel for respondent, however, submits that it was justified action.



5. After hearing arguments for some time, learned counsel for petitioner submits that without prejudice to his rights and contentions, he would move appropriate application before the concerned Court seeking appropriate directions in view of the aforesaid alleged wrong adjustment of the security amount.
6. In view of the above, present petition stands disposed of as not pressed.
7. Liberty, as prayed, is granted.
8. All the rights and contentions of the parties are reserved.

MANOJ JAIN, J

JANUARY 13, 2025/dr