



\$~20

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

+ **CM(M) 660/2025**

SEEMA MALHOTRA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Yash Gupta, Advocate

versus

RAKESH NAGPAL

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Indu Kaul, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

% **30.05.2025**

CM APPL. 35607/2025(exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

CM APPL. 35606/2025

1. Petitioner seeks further eight weeks to vacate the premises in question.
2. This Court has gone through judgment dated 08.04.2025 and after appreciating the rival contentions, and keeping in mind the medical condition cited by the Judgment Debtor and the fact that her children were to appear in examination, this Court had given indulgence to her with a caveat that no further request for extension would be entertained from her side and in case, she fails to vacate the premises in question, she might be, even, hauled up for committing contempt of Court.
3. It seems that despite giving a specific undertaking in this regard, the petitioner has come up with request for extension, without there being any extra-ordinary change in the circumstances.
4. Application, being completely devoid of any merit, is dismissed.

MANOJ JAIN, J

MAY 30, 2025/sw/JS