



\$~2

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

+ C.R.P. 293/2025, CM APPL. 66285/2025, 66286/2025 & 66307/2025

RAM SHANKAR DAS AND ORSPetitioners

Through: Mr. Anuraag Mehta and Mr. Ganga Sagar Singh, Advocates.

versus

SUSHIL VERMARespondent

Through: Mr. Tanishq Sirohi and Mr. Suryansh Vashisth, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **12.11.2025**

1. The petitioner has filed the present revision petition under Section 115 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 ["CPC"], against an order dated 17.04.2025 passed by the Trial Court, by which the suit instituted by the respondent was partly decreed under Order XII Rule 6 of CPC.
2. At the outset, it may be noted that a revision petition is not maintainable against a decree. The appropriate remedy available to the petitioner lies elsewhere in law.
3. During the course of hearing, Mr. Anuraag Mehta, learned counsel for the petitioner, submitted that the petitioner had initially preferred a Regular First Appeal before this Court on 07.07.2025, which came to be converted into a revision petition pursuant to an objection raised by the Registry.



4. The aforesaid position is, however, disputed.
5. Be that as it may, without entering into the said controversy, it is evident that the present revision petition is not maintainable under Section 115 of CPC.
6. The revision petition is, accordingly, dismissed as not maintainable, with liberty to the petitioner to avail appropriate remedies in accordance with law. All pending applications also stand disposed of.
7. As regards the question of limitation for filing the appeal, the petitioner shall be at liberty to take appropriate steps in such proceedings, including to seek the benefit of Section 14 of the Limitation Act, 1963, for the period during which the present revision petition remained pending before this Court.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

NOVEMBER 12, 2025
SS/SD/