



2026:DHC:2956



* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

% *Reserved on: 14th January, 2026*
Pronounced on: 09th April, 2026

+ RFA 471/2022

**LALA SHER SINGH MEMORIAL JEEVAN
VIGYAN TRUST SOCIETY**

through its Authorised Signatory,
Sh. Rajiv Narang,
Address: Plot No.18, Sector-22,
Dwarka, New Delhi.

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Sanjay Madan, Advocate.

versus

GAYATRI GUPTA

W/o SH. Ashok Kumar Gupta,
R/o D-4/3, Model Town-III, Delhi.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Amar Nath Gupta and
Mr. Santosh Kumar Sahu, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

J U D G M E N T

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J.

1. Regular First Appeal under Section 96 of CPC has been filed on behalf of the *Appellant i.e. Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society* against Judgment and Decree dated 07.06.2022 passed by learned ADJ-02, Delhi, i whereby Leave to Defend Application filed by Defendant No.3 / Appellant was dismissed and the *Suit of the Plaintiff / Respondent for recovery of Rs.17,81,531/- along with interest @ 18% per annum, has been decreed.*



2. Plaintiff / Respondent had filed Suit bearing No. CS DJ ADJ No. 220/2020 under Order XXXVII of CPC for recovery of Rs.17,81,531/- along with *pendente lite* and future interest.

3. **Brief facts** as narrated therein were that *Defendant No.1 / Presidium Dwarka Sector-22 School* was headed by its Chairperson, Mrs. Sudha Gupta. *Defendant No.2 / Ms. Neerja Chawla*, was Regional Head Business Development and Authorised Signatory of Defendant No.1/School, who was operating from the premises of Mother's Pride School, located at 11/77, West Punjabi Bagh, New Delhi. *Defendant No.3 / Presidium Educational & Charitable Trust* was controlling the operations of Defendant No.1/School. *Defendant No.4 / Presidium Educational Institution Private Limited*, was private limited Company, had been controlling the overall operations of other Defendants. Its Director Mrs. Raj Rani Gupta, was the mother-in-law of Mrs. Sudha Gupta, Chairperson of Defendant No.1 / School.

4. It was further asserted that Defendant Nos.1 and 4 were known to the husband of the Plaintiff, for several years. In the month of May, 2017, Defendant Nos.1 and 4 sought a loan of Rs.15,00,000/- for the infrastructural development of Presidium School, Sector 22, Dwarka and assured that they would pay an interest @ 13% per annum payable monthly. They also assured that the amount would be returned within a year.

5. Believing the assurance of the Defendants and considering the amicable relationship, Plaintiff lent a sum of Rs.15,00,000/- through cheque dated 02.05.2017, which was encashed on 06.05.2017. Defendant No.2 / Neerja Chawla, on the instructions of Presidium School and Presidium Educational Institution Private Limited and being the Authorized Signatory



of Presidium School, Sector 22, Dwarka, issued a Demand Promissory Note and Receipt of consideration of Promissory Note, both dated 02.05.2017, under her signatures and the Seal of the School. The principal amount was returned by Defendant No.3 vide *three cheques dated 07.04.2018 and 07.05.2018 towards principal and interest, in the sum of Rs.14,625/- each*. All the three cheques, on presentations, were dishonoured for the reasons “*drawer’s signatures not as per mandate*” or “*drawer’s signatures differ*”.

6. The Plaintiff approached the Defendants for return of the loan amount, who assured that they would be able to arrange the funds in a few month / weeks. The Plaintiff again made several requests and made personal visits, despite which loan amount was not deposited. Therefore, Plaintiff filed *Suit for recovery of a principal amount of Rs.15,00,000/- and the interest amount, totalling to Rs.17,81,531/-*.

7. *Leave to Defend Application under Order XXXVII Rule 3 CPC* was filed on behalf of Defendant No.3 / Presidium Educational & Charitable Trust, wherein it was asserted that Plaintiff has impleaded Defendant No.3 as “*Presidium Educational & Charitable Trust; Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society*.” However, Presidium Educational & Charitable Trust is a trust, registered under the Trust Act, wherein the Lala Sher Singh Charitable Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society is a Society registered under the Societies Registration Act, 1860. *Both are separate legal entities and could not have been clubbed together as one entity*. There is no legal entity in the name, arrayed as Defendant No.3.

8. The Plaintiff herself is not clear whether Presidium Educational & Charitable Trust and Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust



Society, is one or separate. *The Suit is therefore, bad for misjoinder of parties.*

9. It is further asserted that as per the Plaint and the Memo of Parties, alleged amount was paid to Presidium School, Sector 22, Dwarka, at the instance of Defendant No.4 / the Presidium Educational Institution Private Limited and the amount was used by the Presidium Group. Even if, Defendant No.4 gave a TDS Certificate for the interest for Financial Years 2016-2017 and 2017-2018, it would not make the Suit maintainable against answering Defendant No.3.

10. As per the case of the Plaintiff herself, Defendant No.1 is a Public School, controlled and operated by Defendant No.3, which is a Charitable Trust. The Applicant is a Registered Society, under the Societies Act, but is not controlling or operating the school. This fact is evident from the impleadment of Defendant No.3 through its Chairman / Trustee Sh. G. S. Matharoo. *The Suit is not maintainable against the answering Defendant.*

11. Further, the Plaintiff in her Plaint, had stated that Defendant No.4 is a Company, which is controlling the overall operations of the Defendant; thereby Applicant Society is not responsible for the aforesaid acts.

12. *Defendant No.2/ Mrs. Neerja Chawla* was not an employee of the Applicant Society and has been operating from the premises of Mother's Pride, West Punjabi Bagh. She is not an Authorised Representative of the Applicant

13. Likewise, as per the Plaintiff, Defendant No.4, owned and run various schools under the brand name of *Presidium*, having many schools in Dwarka. The alleged Promissory Note and Receipt purported to have been



executed by Defendant No. 2, does not prove that the Receipt was issued on behalf of Presidium School, Dwarka, or that she was authorised to issue the Receipt. There was no contract for payment of interest; the Plaintiff has claimed additional amount which is beyond the scope of Order XXXVII and the Suit is not maintainable.

14. The returns of the cheques and subsequent Demand Notice, do not disclose any cause of action to file the present Suit under Order XXXVII C.P.C. Therefore, the Defendant is entitled for Leave to Defend the Suit.

15. It is further asserted that *there is no cause of action* disclosed in the Plaint and the Suit is not maintainable. It is claimed that substantial defences have been raised and answering Defendant No.3 is entitled to Leave to Defend the present Suit.

16. The **Plaintiff, in her Reply to the Leave to Defend Application**, has explained that the refund cheque dated 30.04.2018 for Rs.15,00,000/- and two cheques towards interest, were duly issued by the Defendant / Presidium School, Sector 22, Dwarka (A-U-O Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society). Therefore, the said Trust was necessary party to the Suit and it is denied that the Suit is bad for misjoinder of the parties.

17. It is further submitted that Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society, had deducted TDS on interest payments for Financial Year 2017-18; which is evident from the Plaintiff's Income-Tax Form 26AS issued to her for A.Y. 2018-19. Further, even though Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society deducted TDS on the interest cheques for Rs.14,625/- each, but the TDS amounts have not been deposited



with the Income-Tax Authorities, which is evident from the Income-Tax Form 26AS of the Plaintiff, for the A.Y. 2019-20.

18. It is vehemently denied that the Suit is not maintainable against Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society.

19. Furthermore, it is denied that Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society is not controlling or operating Presidium School, Dwarka. The School Affiliation Certificate issued by the CBSE clearly stated that the school is managed by Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society. Therefore, the Suit is maintainable against Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society, under the Chairmanship of Mr. G. S. Matharoo, which is liable to refund the loan amount,

20. The Plaintiff further asserted that the Defendant has concealed its relationships with former Defendant No.4 / Presidium Educational Institution Private Ltd. The Demand Promissory Note dated 02.05.2017 was issued by Mrs. Neerja Chawla (*though wrongly stated as Mrs. Neerja Bhatia*), authorized signatory of the Presidium School.

21. Likewise, Receipt of consideration of Promissory Note was issued on behalf of Presidium School, Sector 22, Dwarka, managed and run by the Defendant Society. It was denied that there was no contract for payment of interest or that the Suit under Order XXXVII, was not maintainable.

22. It is therefore, submitted that *there was no ground for grant of Leave to Defend*, which was liable to be dismissed and the Suit of the Plaintiff be Decreed.

23. **Learned District Judge, during the trial, in the Order dated 20.08.2020,** observed that averments in the Plaint were made against Mrs.



Neerja Chawla, employee of the Society, who was signatory of the Promissory Note and Receipt, issued to the Plaintiff on behalf of Defendant No.2 / School.

24. The Service Report on the Summons dated 08.10.2019 was that Mrs. Neerja Chawla, the employee, had already left the employment of the school. Defendant No.4 / Presidium School and Presidium Educational Institution Private Limited had no *locus* in the present dispute between the Society and the Plaintiff, which is money claim. It was also observed that Mrs. Sudha Gupta, Chairperson of Presidium School, Sector 22, Dwarka, had also been impleaded as Defendant No.1.

25. It was observed that the arraying of Defendant Nos.1, 2 and 4 by the Plaintiff as parties to the Suit seemed as a desperate attempt on the part of the Plaintiff to exert pressure and cause grave hardship to the Defendants, when in fact the claim for money was only against the Society of Defendant No.3. There was no logic understandable in impleading the Society through its President Mr. G. S. Matharoo, to whom the service of Summons under Order XXXVII of CPC had been affected.

26. No purpose would be served in impleading the Chairman of the Society as an independent party and also the employee, who has left employment. *Neither Defendant No.2 nor Defendant No.4 was held to be necessary party to the Suit. Thus, names of Defendant Nos.1, 2 and 4 were deleted under Order I Rule 10 CPC.*

27. The appearance under Order XXXVII Rule 3(1) CPC on behalf of the Society, i.e. Presidium Educational and Charitable Trust, filed on



11.10.2019, was accepted and the summons for Judgement, were directed to be served upon Defendant No.3.

28. Learned District Judge, in the impugned Order dated 07.06.2022, observed that the liability of payment of Rs.15,00,000/- along with interest, had not been denied and that there was no whisper in this regard. The entire emphasis of the Applicant was only on one fact that the Applicant Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society is a separate entity and has nothing to do with the present case, as the liability was either of Presidium School, Sector 22, Dwarka or Presidium Educational & Charitable Trust.

29. Admittedly, Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society has not annexed any document to substantiate its claim that is a separate legal entity and it has nothing to do with either Presidium School, Sector 22, Dwarka or Presidium Educational & Charitable Trust. Lala Sher Singh memorial along with the Application for appearance filed before the Court in compliance of Order XXXVII Rule 3(1) of CPC, mentioned the following address for service of summons for Judgment:-

*“Prudence School (earlier Presidium School),
through its Manager,
Plot No.18, Dwarka Sector-22
(opposite Green Valley Apartment)
New Delhi-110077.”*

30. From the above address given by the Applicant, it became abundantly clear that the Applicant i.e., Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society is running Prudence School, which is earlier named as Presidium School from Plot No.18, Sector 22, Dwarka.



31. Furthermore, in the cheque, it has been mentioned that it has been issued on behalf of Presidium School, Sector 22, Dwarka (A-U-O Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society). The nomenclature A-U-O means "A Unit Of". Further, reference was made to the Form 26AS, whereby the interest TDS certificate was given by Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society. Further, affiliation issued by CBSE also reflected that the School was run by the Trust / Society of Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society, of which Sh. G. S. Matharoo was the Chairman. Even the Treasurer of Prudence School, namely Akash Gupta, is the President of Presidium Educational and Charitable Trust.

32. It was held that it was only for this reason that the name of Presidium School, Sector 22 Dwarka, Presidium Educational & Charitable Trust and Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society had been used interchangeably in various documents. Most importantly, the Plaintiff had arrayed, by way of abundant caution and to avoid any technicalities, all the entities as party to the present Suit. Even the Presidium Educational Institution Pvt. Ltd. had been arrayed as Defendant No.4, as in the Promissory Note the Word "Company" was used.

33. It was further observed that even if it is accepted that Presidium Educational & Charitable Trust and Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society are separate entities, the Applicant / Defendant No.3 cannot escape the truth that Presidium School, Sector 22, Dwarka was in fact, run by it. The nomenclature "Presidium" only represents the brand name under which the Applicant / Defendant No.3 is running the school and it has no separate legal identity. It is also only for this reason, the name of



Applicant / Defendant No. 3 was mentioned in the brackets, on the three cheques issued to the Plaintiff.

34. Furthermore, Defendant No.3 itself gave the address for service of summons for Judgment of Prudence School, Sector 22, Dwarka, which again reflected that they were one entity. Merely because the name of Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society, was mentioned along with that of Presidium Educational & Charitable Trust as Defendant No.3, does not absolve Defendant No.3 from the liability, on the technical defence. **Hence, the Leave to Defend Application was dismissed and the Suit of the Plaintiff was decreed.**

35. *Aggrieved by the said Judgement, present Appeal had been preferred.* The **grounds of challenge** are that grant of Leave is the ordinary Rule and denial is an exception. Reference has been made to be B. L. Kashyap & Sons Ltd. Versus JMS Steels & Power Corporation, C.A. No.379/2022, wherein it has been observed that if there remains a reasonable doubt about the probability of defence, sterner or higher conditions could be imposed while granting Leave to Defend, but denying the Leave would be ordinarily countenanced only in such cases where Defendant fails to show any genuine triable issue and the defence is found to be frivolous or vexatious.

36. Learned Trial Court has misconstrued that Defendant No.1, a public School was being controlled and operated by Defendant No.3, which is a Charitable Trust.

37. The Appellant, as per the Plaintiff, is a Society registered under the Societies Act, which is also evident from the impleadment of Defendant



No.3, through its Chairman / Trustee. Therefore, the Suit was not maintainable against the Appellant.

38. It is further asserted that Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society and Presidium Educational & Charitable Trust are different legal entities and not connected to each other and Leave to Defend should have been allowed.

39. It was claimed that learned District Judge has misconstrued that as Defendant No.3 had been defined as both, Presidium Educational & Charitable Trust as well as the Trust: Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society, while there is no such independent entity in existence and therefore, the explanation of the learned District Judge, is not tenable in this regard.

40. Furthermore, the impugned Order dated 07.06.2022 has been passed against Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society and the name of Defendant No.3 Presidium Educational & Charitable Trust is missing, which means no Decree has been passed against Defendant No.3. In fact, the Decree has been passed against the person, who was not the original Defendant.

41. It is further asserted that Defendant No.3 had remained unserved therefore, treating the Application of Leave to Defend filed on behalf of Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society, on behalf of Defendant No.3, is bad and not sustainable.

42. Learned District Judge has ignored that after Order dated 20.08.2020 deleting Defendant Nos.1, 2 & 4, only Defendant No.3 survived as sole



Defendant. This is a case of non-application of judicial mind and substantial miscarriage of justice and the impugned Order is not sustainable.

43. Moreover, as per the Report of the Nazir dated 14.09.2020, Summons had been issued to Defendant No.3 i.e., Presidium Educational and Charitable Trust, which were received unserved. Therefore, when the sole Defendant had been unserved, the Decree could not have followed.

44. It has also not been considered that there was no privity of contract between the Plaintiff and the Appellant. It has been erroneously observed by the learned District Judge that no documents had been filed by the Appellant to show that Appellant and Defendant No.3 are two different entities.

45. On the contrary, it is neither the case of the Plaintiff nor the documents have been filed by the Plaintiff to claim that Appellant and Defendant No.3 are the same entity.

46. In the present case, the Appellant had raised serious question of maintainability of the case against a third party i.e. the Appellant, which entitled him to unconditional Leave to Defend, but the same has not been considered.

47. Furthermore, an Application under Section 153 CPC had been filed on behalf of the Plaintiff to make following persons as Defendant No.1:

- (i) *The Presidium School, Sec 22, Dwarka*
- (ii) *Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society.*

48. But this Application had not been decided and the Leave to Defend Application, has been rejected. **It is submitted that the aforesaid Judgement be set aside and the Leave to Defend Application of the Appellant be allowed.**



Submissions Heard and Record Perused.

49. The case of the Plaintiff/**Respondent**, was that she had given a loan of Rs.15,00,000/- to Presidium School, Sector 22, Dwarka, for which a demand Promissory Note was duly executed on 02.05.2017, on which Ms. Neerja Chawla, as authorized signatory, had signed.

50. It was asserted by the Plaintiff that having so received the loan, three cheques, one cheque dated 30.04.2018 for principal amount of Rs.15,00,000/- and other two cheques dated 07.04.2018 and 07.05.2018 of Rs.14,625/- each, had been issued by *Presidium School, Sector-22, Dwarka (A-U-O Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society)*, though all three cheques on presentation got dishonoured with Returning Memo dated 16.05.2018 with remarks '*Drawers's signature not as per mandate or drawers' signature differ*'.

51. *First main contention* raised on behalf of the Appellant is that Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society was never impleaded as party, but decree has been passed only its name. The objection was taken the sole surviving Defendant No.3, was in fact Presidium Educational & Charitable Trust. Since, Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society was not made a party, decree could not have been passed against it, which is third party.

52. *First aspect*, which may be emphasized is that Defendant No.1 / Presidium School, Sector-22, Dwarka; Defendant No.2 Neerja Chawla (Authorized Signatory) and Defendant No.4 Presidium Educational Institution Private Limited have been deleted by learned District Judge vide



Order dated 20.08.2020 by observing that they were not necessary party to the Suit.

53. Pertinently, in Defendant No.3, both Presidium Educational & Charitable Trust and Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society have been mentioned and they were clubbed as one entity. Even if the contention of the Appellant is accepted that these two are separate entities, then merely because they were shown as Defendant No.3, would not imply that Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society was not a party to the present Suit. This is further evident from the fact that on receiving the summons for appearance, Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society had furnished its address for service of summons for Judgment, which was that of the school. To say that Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society was not a party or that it had not received any summons would be to take hyper-technical objection, which in substance, has no merits.

54. The Presidium Educational & Charitable Trust may not be a relevant party, *but definitely Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society was the main party, which had survived after deletion of Defendant Nos.1, 2 and 4.* It is frivolous plea taken by Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society that it was not a party to the present Suit. Hyper-technicality or mere error in mentioning the two entities as separate Defendants or putting them as one, does not take away the substance of impleading both the entities. ***Learned District Judge therefore, rightly rejected this contention of the Appellant.***



55. Another and more relevant contention was that Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society had no concern with the loan allegedly taken by Presidium School, Sector-22, Dwarka through its Authorized Signatory Neerja Chawla.

56. In this context, it is pertinent to refer to these three cheques which reflect that they have been issued on behalf of Presidium School, Sector-22, Dwarka (*A-U-O Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society*). Cheques were signed by two *Authorized Signatories of Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society*. For them, now to say that they had not issued these cheques, would be to turn back on a document, which speaks otherwise.

57. It is evident from the name of the two Signatories on the cheques that Presidium School, Sector-22, Dwarka was a Unit of Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society and the cheques had been issued by this Society. It cannot now deny its liability under these three cheques.

58. The plea that the loan had not been taken by Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society is absolutely not acceptable for the loan may have been taken by Presidium School, Sector-22, Dwarka, but the cheques had been issued by Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society. The consideration may have been to a third party i.e. the school, *but the cheques clearly show the privity of contract between the Plaintiff and Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society*.

59. It has been rightly observed by learned District Judge that signature of the Authorized Signatory of Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust



Society on these three cheques, *clearly speak of the contract between the Plaintiff and the Appellant.*

60. The last circumstance to conclude the controversy, is the Form 26AS, whereby the interest TDS Certificate was given by Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society. Further, affiliation issued by CBSE also reflected that the school was run by the Trust / Society of Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society, of which Sh. G. S. Matharoo was the Chairman. Even the Treasurer of Prudence School, namely Akash Gupta, is the President of Presidium Educational and Charitable Trust.

61. Learned District Judge has also rightly observed that after the service of summons for appearance the address for service of summons for Judgment was given as that of Presidium School, which again shows that School was merely a Unit of Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society, which responsible for the activities of the school.

62. The next contention raised on behalf of the Appellant is that *there was no agreement in respect of the interest amount*, which has been awarded in the present Suit and therefore, the Suit did not come within the scope of Section 37 of CPC. However, *firstly*, as has already been referred, the demand Promissory Note dated 02.05.2017, which clearly stipulated that interest @ 13% per annum with monthly interest shall be payable to the Promissory Note holder and duration of return of loan was specified as 12 months. This loan was duly received by Presidium School, which was acknowledged vide Receipt of consideration dated 02.05.2017.

63. *Secondly*, claim of the Respondent is based on three cheques, out of which subsequent two cheques were towards interest. The case of the



Plaintiff thus, rests on the three cheques, which amount to the Suit amount of Rs.17,81,531/-. *Therefore, the assertion that by inclusion of interest in the present Suit, it went beyond the scope of Order XXXVII of CPC, is not tenable.*

64. It has also been asserted that an Application under Section 153 of CPC was filed by the Plaintiff, in view of the objections taken on behalf of the Respondent / Appellant to implead Presidium School, Sector-22, Dwarka and Lala Sher Singh Memorial Jeevan Vigyan Trust Society, through its Chairman Sh. G. S. Matharoo, but this Application never got decided, while Leave to Defend Application was dismissed and the Suit was decreed.

65. In this regard it may be noted that it is evidently, the Application was made to avoid any technical objection. However, in the light of aforesaid discussion, the non-decision of this Application is irrelevant, as the liability of the Appellant is clearly, established from the aforesaid discussion.

66. In the end, it may be observed that the Appellant being the Society running one of the most prestigious chain of School's in Delhi and NCR, cannot be expected to contest a case for mere recovery of Rs.15,00,000/- Lacs received in the account of the School, which is also established by the cheques.

67. There is no merit in the present Appeal, which is hereby, **dismissed**.

68. The pending Applications are disposed of accordingly.

(NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA)
JUDGE

APRIL 09, 2026/R