



\$~54&56

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
% ***Date of Decision: 21st May, 2025***
+ CM(M) 947/2025, CM APPL. 31074/2025 & CM APPL. 31075/2025
PRANAV ANSALPetitioner

Through: Mr. Malak Bhatt with Ms. Neeha Nagpal and Mr. Saahil Bahety, Advocates.

versus

PRITI PAL SINGH AHUJA THROUGH ITS LEGAL HEIRS

.....Respondent

Through: None.

56

+ CM(M) 949/2025, CM APPL. 31078/2025 & CM APPL. 31079/2025
SUSHIL ANSALPetitioner

Through: Mr. Malak Bhatt with Ms. Neeha Nagpal and Mr. Saahil Bahety, Advocates.

versus

PRITI PAL SINGH AHUJA THROUGH ITS LEGAL HEIRS

.....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

JUDGMENT (oral)

1. Both the petitions are being taken up together as the grievance raised by the petitioners, is, more or less, similar.
2. The impugned order is dated 01.05.2025 and has been passed by Id. District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (hereinafter referred to as *District Commission*) while taking up Execution Petition registered as EX No. 84/2024. Such order reads as under:-

"01.05.2025

EA/84/2024

Pr. Counsel for DH

Counsel for JD



Present execution has been filed to execute the order dated 15.01.2024.

No payment has been brought today. In view of the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal nos. 3640-3642 of 2025 titled "Periyannal (Dead) through LRS & Ors Vs Rajamani and Anr. Etc." dated 06.03.2025, nonbailable warrants be issued against the director of JD Shahzad Ahmad, Ashish Sharma, Pranav Aansal, Vikas Jain, Sanchit Jain, Rishab Jain, Abdul Soni, Naresh Gupta, Sandeep Kohli & Anoop Sethi for 16.05.2025 through SHO concerned."

3. It is informed that the matter was again taken up by learned District Commission on 16.05.2025 and perhaps fresh *non-bailable warrants* have been issued for 27.05.2025. It is, however, submitted that order has yet not been uploaded on the website of District Commission.
4. According to learned counsel for petitioners- Mr. Pranav Ansal and Mr. Sushil Ansal, the Execution Petition had been filed against *M/s Ansal Hightech Townships Ltd./JD Company* only.
5. It is submitted that the complaint was also filed against the abovesaid Company only and the final order is also against such company.
6. No other individual, including any Director, was ever a part in complaint and, therefore, not judgment debtor either and, therefore, it is not, at all, clear as to on what basis, learned Commission has issued *non-bailable warrants* against them.
7. Undoubtedly, as per directions contained in *Periyammal v. V. Rajamani*, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 507, the execution petition needs to be fast-tracked and has to be decided within a period of six months, but at the same time, it does not mean that, merely, because no payment has been made by the concerned JD Company, the Executing Court, without any prior notice, can issue *non-bailable warrants* against its Directors.



8. It is apprised that no application under Order XXI Rule 41 (2) CPC was moved either. It is also apprised that Mr. Pranav Ansal was never a Director in the JD Company.

9. It is also supplemented that the name of Mr. Sushil Ansal is, though, conspicuously, missing in order dated 01.05.2025, as per the information available with the petitioner, the warrants have also been prepared against Mr. Sushil Ansal, without there being any corresponding order in this regard.

10. None appears on behalf of respondent/decreed holder, despite advance notice.

11. Fact remains, during course of the arguments, learned counsel for petitioners submitted that he has no intention to avoid the execution proceedings and would ensure that both the petitioners appear before the learned District Commission on next date of hearing which is stated to be 27.05.2025.

12. It is also submitted that, though, petitioner Mr. Sushil Ansal is eighty five years old, he would still appear before the learned District Commission on said date and would also make request for his exemption from personal appearance while undertaking that his counsel would render full assistance and corporation to the learned District Commission.

13. It is also submitted that, even otherwise, since the decree was against JD Company, the learned District Commission could not have issued warrants against its Directors in the manner in which it has been done, without their being any prior notice of any kind whatsoever.

14. Be that as it may, since an assurance has been given today that both the abovesaid petitioners would appear before the learned District Commission on 27.05.2025, the present petition is disposed of with the directions that such



warrants are recalled.

15. Once they appear before the learned District Commission, it will be upto the learned District Commission to consider any application moved by them and then to pass appropriate order in accordance with law.

16. Learned counsel for petitioner has also submitted that the impugned order was challenged by him, by filing an appeal before the learned Delhi State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission. However, since they did not get any early date of hearing there and since the warrants were looming large on their head, they were compelled to file present petitions. It is submitted that in view of the abovesaid relief granted to them, the petitioners would also withdraw their such appeals. Let these be withdrawn accordingly.

17. Both the petitions stand disposed of in aforesaid terms.

18. A copy of this order be given *dasti* under the signatures of Court Master.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

MAY 21, 2025/sw/PB