



2026:DHC:868



\$~38

\* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

*Date of Decision: 03<sup>rd</sup> February, 2026*

+ CM(M) 264/2026

NAVENDU AGRAWAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manu Beri, Ms. Kudrat Mann and  
Mr. Raunek Raheja, Advocates.

versus

MRS VARTIKA GOYAL &amp; ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sudeep Singh and Mr. Rishabh  
Bhardwaj, Advocates for R-3.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJNEESH KUMAR GUPTA****ORDER (Oral)****Rajneesh Kumar Gupta, J.**

1. This hearing has been conducted through hybrid mode.

**CM APPL. 7256/2026 (for exemptions)**

2. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions. Application stands disposed of.

**CM(M) 264/2026 & CM APPL. 7255/2026 (for Stay)**3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, 1950, assailing the order dated 17<sup>th</sup> October, 2025, passed by the learned trial court in case bearing no. in CS SCJ 81/21, whereby the application of the petitioner for waiving of cost has been partly allowed and the cost has been reduced from Rs. 1,500/- to Rs. 1,000/-.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent no. 3 has appeared on advance notice and accepts notice.

5. Heard. Record perused.

6. *Vide* order dated 18<sup>th</sup> August, 2025, the learned trial court allowed the



2026:DHC:868



application filed by the petitioner under Order VII Rule 14 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 thereby taking five documents of the petitioner on record, subject to payment of costs of ₹1,500/-. Thereafter, *vide* the impugned order dated 17th October, 2025, the costs were reduced to Rs 1,000/-.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is an indigent person and is suffering from 100% visual disability and therefore, is not in a financial position to pay the cost of Rs. 1,000/-, as imposed by the learned trial court.

8. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondents has argued that the petitioner is involved in multiple litigations with other parties also and is financially capable of paying the said cost.

9. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case as the documents of the petitioner have been taken on record, this Court is of the opinion that the cost of Rs. 1,000/-, as imposed is nominal. So, the impugned order does not require any interference by this Court.

10. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed as being devoid of any merits. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

**RAJNEESH KUMAR GUPTA, J**

**FEBRUARY 03, 2026**

*v/ik*