



2025:DHC:11406



\$~49

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

%

Date of Decision: 16.12.2025

+

CM(M) 2420/2025, CM APPL. 79102/2025, 79104/2025 & 79103/2025

RANJANA ARORA

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Chetna, Advocate with petitioner
in person.

versus

DEVENDER KUMAR NOW DECEASED THROUGH LEGAL
HEIRS AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: SI Omkant Yadav, PS Hauz Qazi.

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA**ORDER (ORAL)**

1. Petitioner/plaintiff has assailed order dated 13.10.2025 of the learned trial court, whereby her application under Order VII Rule 14 CPC filed at the stage of final arguments was dismissed. Having heard learned counsel for petitioner/plaintiff, I do not find it a fit case to even issue notice.

2. Broadly speaking, at the stage of final arguments in the suit pending since the year 2011, the petitioner/plaintiff filed an application under Order

CM(M) 2420/2025

Page 1 of 4 pages

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: NEETU N NAIR
Signing Date: 16.12.2025
17:25:28GIRISH
KATHPALIA



2025:DHC:11406



VII Rule 14 CPC seeking to place on record certain additional documents, pleading vaguely in paragraph 3 of the application that the subject additional documents could not be filed earlier as due to inadvertence, the petitioner/plaintiff had misplaced those documents.

3. By way of the impugned order, the learned trial court, after hearing both sides dismissed the said application of the petitioner/plaintiff, observing that the application appeared to have been moved only to delay the disposal of the suit and under the garb of the said application, the petitioner/plaintiff was trying to reopen evidence.

4. Learned counsel for petitioner/plaintiff submits that the impugned order is not sustainable in the eyes of law. It is contended that the subject additional documents are vital evidence to prove the case of the petitioner/plaintiff. As regards failure to file the subject additional documents at appropriate stage, it is contended by learned counsel that petitioner/plaintiff is a senior citizen lady.

5. To begin with, admittedly, petitioner/plaintiff is not a lay person. The petitioner/plaintiff is a retired Inspector of Customs and Excise Department. No specific reason has been mentioned in the application or during arguments as to why the subject additional documents were not filed at appropriate stage. A mere submission that the said documents got misplaced and were not traceable cannot be accepted at the fag end of the suit, which, in any case, is pending for more than a decade and a half. The subject

CM(M) 2420/2025

Page 2 of 4 pages

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: NEETU N NAIR
Signing Date: 16.12.2025
17:25:28

GIRISH
KATHPALIA



2025:DHC:11406



additional documents span across the period from 2010 to 2019 and going by the nature of those documents as reflected in the application under Order VII Rule 14 CPC, it does not sound believable that petitioner/plaintiff had no access to those documents. All those documents are of such nature that copies thereof could always be obtained by the petitioner/plaintiff from the concerned government authorities.

6. Further, there is not even a whisper as to when, how and from where the subject documents got traced out.

7. I find substance in the opinion of the learned trial court that petitioner/plaintiff is trying to reopen the entire case at the stage of final arguments. If the petitioner/plaintiff is granted opportunity to file the subject additional documents at this stage, she would have to be granted an opportunity to prove the same in accordance with law and consequently, the other side also shall have to be granted similar opportunity.

8. There is another aspect. It appears that one of the subject additional documents is a sale deed, pertaining to which an application was filed in the year 2015 but that application was dismissed by the trial court and that order having not been challenged has attained finality.

9. In view of the aforesaid, I am unable to find any infirmity, much less perversity in the impugned order that would call for interference under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, so the same is upheld.

CM(M) 2420/2025

Page 3 of 4 pages

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: NEETU N NAIR
Signing Date: 16.12.2025
17:25:28

GIRISH
KATHPALIA

Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA, o=, ou=, c=IN
Reason: I am unable to verify the signature
because the certificate is not available.



2025:DHC:11406



10. The petition is totally devoid of merit, so the petition and the accompanying applications are dismissed.

GIRISH
KATHPALIA

Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI,
2.5.4.20=8401d8889b27a77b2865ffffe4afec4
5569af3962c6fb4835d435f97626cacca,
ou=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, CN=7047638,
postalCode=110003, st=Delhi,
serialNumber=d3e86796451ec45c07b5d155
709996b40f80cbcd2ee60402c487965f801e2
6fa, cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA
Date: 2025.12.16 17:22:05 -08'00'

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

DECEMBER 16, 2025/ry

CM(M) 2420/2025

Page 4 of 4 pages

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: NEETU N NAIR
Signing Date: 16.12.2025
17:25:28