



\$~5

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **FAO (COMM) 22/2026 CM APPL. 4772/2026 CM APPL. 4773/2026**
NARESH KUMAR GOYALAppellant

Through: Dr. Anand Duggal and Ms. Inderjot
Kaur, Advs.

versus

MANSHA ACTIVE PRIVATE LIMITED & ANR.....Respondents
Through: None

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DINESH MEHTA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR

% **ORDER**
23.01.2026

1. By way of present appeal, the appellant has challenged the order dated 08.01.2026 passed by learned District Judge (Commercial Court-06), Tis Hazari (*hereinafter referred to as 'the Court'*), whereby appellant's application under Order XI Rule 1 CPC seeking leave to place certain documents has been rejected.
2. The appeal has been preferred under Section 13(1A) of the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 (*hereinafter referred to as the 'Act of 2015'*). If the provisio to Section 13(1A) of the Act of 2015 is taken into account, an appeal is provided only in relation to those orders, where against an appeal has been specifically provided under Order XLIII CPC.
3. None of the provisions of Order XLIII CPC provides an appeal against an interlocutory order of the nature which has been passed by the



Court (rejecting application for placing documents on record).

4. We are, therefore, of the considered opinion that the instant appeal is not maintainable.
5. The appeal is dismissed accordingly.
6. Pending applications, if any are also disposed of as infructuous.

DINESH MEHTA, J

VINOD KUMAR, J

JANUARY 23, 2026/cd