



\$~18

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

+ **FAO(OS) 156/2025, CM APPL. 81441/2025 (Ex.), CM APPL. 81442/2025 (Delay of 11 days in filing the appeal) & CM APPL. 81443/2025 (Delay of 9 days in Re-filing the appeal)**

DR MUKESH AGGARWAL & ANR.Appellants

Through: **Mr. Ankur Chhibber and Mr. Nikunj Arora, Advocates.**

versus

SMT NEETU SURI & ORS.Respondents

Through: **Mr. Lalit Gupta, Advocates for R-2 & R-3.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN

SHANKAR

ORDER

22.12.2025

%

1. The present Appeal, filed under Order XLIII Rule 1(r) of the Civil Procedure Code, 1908 read with Section 10 of the Delhi High Court Act, 1966, challenges the Order dated 09.10.2025, passed by the learned Single Judge of this Court in I.A. 14260/2022 in case being CS(OS) 230/2022, titled "*Smt. Neetu Suri v. Sh. Rajesh Malik & Anr.*", while dismissing the Appellants' application for deletion of their names from the array of parties.

2. While filing the Suit, the Respondent No. 1 has prayed for partition, rendition of accounts, declaration and decree of permanent injunction.

3. It is claimed that Appellants No. 1 & 2 are individuals to whom the shares held by late Sh. Ved Prakash Malik in M/s. Vee Pee &



Associates Private Limited have been illegally transferred by Respondents No. 2 & 4.

4. In these circumstances, the Court has refused to delete the Appellants from the array of parties.

5. Learned counsel for the Appellants contend that the Appellants are not members of the family and therefore, they are not necessary parties.

6. This Court has considered the submissions.

7. At this stage, there are allegations against the Appellants to the effect that they are beneficiary of illegal transfer of shares by Respondents No. 2 & 4. The Appellants are being given opportunity to contest the case. The case is still pending for adjudication.

8. Hence, in this backdrop, the learned Single Judge has found that it will not be appropriate to delete the name of the Appellants from the array of parties.

9. This Court also finds that the conclusion drawn by the learned Single Judge is plausible and reasonable.

10. Hence, there is no ground to interfere with the Impugned Order.

11. Accordingly, the present Appeal along with pending application(s) stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.
DECEMBER 22, 2025/tk/kr/dj