



\$~38

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

+ LPA 159/2026, CM APPL. 19134/2026 & CM APPL. 19135/2026

SWATI SAISTA

.....Appellant

Through: Appellant-in-Person (through VC).

versus

THE GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Nitika Bhutani, Advocate (Panel Counsel) for Respondent No.1.

Mr. Ajit Kumar & Mr. Shivam Singh, Advocates for Respondent No.2 (through VC).

Ms. Pratima N. Lakra- CGSC along with Ms. Upanita Soumyadarshini & Mr. Shailendra Mishra, Advocates for Respondent No.3 / Ministry of Law & Justice and Ministry of Women & Child Development.

Mr. Venkat Mani Tripathi - Government Pleader for Respondent No.3/Union of India.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

27.03.2026

%

CM APPL. 19136/2026 (Condonation of Delay)

1. For the reasons stated in the Application, the delay of 4 days in filing the Appeal is hereby condoned.
2. The Application stands disposed of.



LPA 159/2026

3. Heard the Appellant-in-Person and Ms. Nitika Bhutani, learned Counsel for Respondent No. 1, Mr. Ajit Kumar learned Counsel for Respondent No. 2 and Ms. Pratima N. Lakra, learned CGSC as well as Mr. Venkat Mani Tripathi, Government Pleader representing Respondent No. 3.

4. By instituting the proceedings of this Letters Patent Appeal, a challenge has been made to an order dated 27.01.2026 (“**Impugned Order**”) passed by the learned Single Judge whereby W.P.(C) 14241/2025 which was instituted by the Appellant challenging the orders dated 26.04.2025 and 19.07.2025 passed by the Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Mahila Court-02, Dwarka Courts, Delhi (“**Mahila Court**”) was dismissed.

5. The learned Single Judge has recorded that finding that the order which was impugned in the writ petition dated 26.04.2025 reveals that the Appellant instead of leading the evidence had been moving various applications before the Superior Courts and that the Mahila Court has found that she was receiving a sum of ₹15,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) in compliance of order dated 18.11.2023 and although various opportunities were given to the Appellant, she, on one pretext or the other, has been avoiding leading evidence. By an order dated 26.04.2025, the Mahila Court granted last opportunity to the Appellant to lead evidence, however, it appears that she did not lead the evidence.

6. The learned Single Judge has also recorded that observations made by the Mahila Court in its order dated 26.04.2025 demonstrates that there has been an attempt on the part of the Appellant not to permit the proceedings to proceed further. It is also relevant to mention that the Mahila Court in its order dated 26.04.2025 gave the Appellant, the last opportunity to lead her evidence



on the next date failing which the Court would consider if the Appellant was interested in pursuing the case and that it will take shall be dismissed for non-prosecution. Similar observations appeared to have been made in the order dated 19.07.2025.

7. Having heard the Appellant-in-Person and the learned Counsel representing Respondent No. 2 and also having perused the records available before us, we find ourselves in complete agreement to the findings accorded by the learned Single Judge in the Impugned Order dated 27.01.2026.

8. No ground for interference in this Appeal is made out, which is, hereby dismissed. We hope and expect that the Appellant shall cooperate in the proceedings pending before the Mahila Court. There shall be no order as to costs.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TEJAS KARIA, J

MARCH 27, 2026/ 'A'