

CNR No.DLST01-044851-2026
CS DJ No.313/2026
Ms. Bansuri Swaraj Vs. Mr. Saurabh Bharadwaj & Ors.

23.04.2026 (10:38 am)

Present:- Sh. Siddhesh Kotwal, Ms. Manya Hasija, Ms. Ana Upadhyay, Sh. Paritosh Kapil and Sh. Shubhansh Patel, Ld. Counsel for the plaintiff.
Sh. Saurabh Guha and Ms. Anupriya Poddar, Ld. Counsel for plaintiff via video conferencing.
Sh. Rishikesh Kumar, Ld. Counsel has filed Vakalatnama on behalf of Defendant no.1 and Memo of Appearance for Defendant no.3 / Aam Aadmi Party.
None for Defendant no.2.

Heard. Perused.

As per reports received, all three defendants were served by e-mail in the afternoon yesterday i.e. 22.04.2026.

Ld. Counsel for the Plaintiff has also filed affidavit of dasti service upon the defendants.

Ld. Counsel for Defendants no.1 and 3 in attendance submits that physical copy with a pendrive containing the video footage was received at 07:30 pm yesterday at office of Defendant no.3. He further submits that reasonable time be granted for filing the reply to interim injunction application of

plaintiff ; whereas the case in hand is not a fit case for grant of interim injunction without taking reply of defendants.

Per contra, Ld. Counsel for the Plaintiff vehemently press for prayer for interim relief in the application under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 CPC read with Section 151 CPC submitting that the defendants are continuously perpetuating the wrong by circulating and disseminating defamatory contents and if not restrained, it would immensely, adversely prejudice plaintiff causing immense harm to her reputation worldwide.

Arguments heard at length from Counsel for the Plaintiff and Counsel for Defendants no.1 and 3 ; whereas, none has appeared for Defendant no.2 despite service by email yesterday.

Alleged defamatory content in pendrive placed by the Plaintiff through Counsel in paper book on record has been seen on computer of the Court, by all in attendance.

Put up for orders after lunch.

(Gurvinder Pal Singh)
Principal District & Sessions Judge (South)
Saket Courts, New Delhi (ab)

ORDER

23.04.2026 (After lunch)

Present : None.

I have heard at length the arguments from Counsel for the Plaintiff and Counsel for Defendants no.1 and 3 ; perused

the material on record ; precedents relied upon by Counsel for the parties and given my thoughtful consideration to the rival contentions put forth on the facet of prayer for interim relief by the Plaintiff.

BRIEF PARTICULARS OF THE PARTIES TO THE LIS

1. **Plaintiff** is a distinguished Indian lawyer, parliamentarian. She is the daughter of the late Smt. Sushma Swaraj, former Union Minister for External Affairs of India, and late Shri. Swaraj Kaushal, former Governor of Mizoram and Senior Advocate of the Supreme Court of India. Plaintiff comes from a family that has made significant contributions to the fields of law and public service in India, and the Plaintiff, in her own capacity, has contributed to both spheres responsibly. Plaintiff holds distinguished academic credentials. Plaintiff has been in active legal practice as an Advocate for over nineteen (19) years, and was designated as a Senior Advocate by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in 2024. Plaintiff entered active electoral politics in 2024 and was elected as a Member of Parliament to the 18th Lok Sabha from the New Delhi Constituency. Plaintiff serves on the Parliamentary Standing Committee on External Affairs, the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Education, Women, Children, Youth and Sports; and

Joint Parliamentary Committee on One Nation One Election.

2. **Defendant No.1**, Mr. Saurabh Bharadwaj, is an Indian politician affiliated with the Defendant No.3. He represented the Greater Kailash Constituency in the Delhi Legislative Assembly for multiple consecutive terms from 2013 to 2025 and served as a Cabinet Minister in successive Delhi Governments. As of date, the Defendant No.1 is the President of the Defendant No.3 (Delhi Unit). The Defendant has also long served as the Official National Spokesperson of the Defendant No.3. He is an active public figure operating significant verified social media accounts across multiple platforms, including Instagram, Facebook, and Twitter (now known as X), collectively commanding a substantial following and significant public reach.
3. **Defendant no.2**, Mr. Ankush Narang, is the Leader of Opposition in the Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD), a Councillor representing Ward 87, Ranjeet Nagar, and the National Joint Secretary of the Defendant No.3. The said Defendant is an active public figure who operates significant social media accounts across multiple platforms, including the platform 'X' (formerly Twitter), collectively commanding a substantial following and significant public reach.

4. **Defendant No.3**, Aam Aadmi Party is a national political party with its headquarters situated at 1, Pandit Ravi Shankar Shukla Lane, near Mandi House, New Delhi - 110001. The Defendant Nos. 1 and 2 are political leaders affiliated to the Party/Defendant No.3.

BRIEF FACTUAL MATRIX OF CASE OF THE PLAINTIFF

5. On 18.04.2026, the Bharatiya Janata Party organised a peaceful, democratic public demonstration of righteous indignation at the purposeful defeat of the Constitution (131st Amendment) Bill, 2026, in the national capital as the 'Aakrosh March'. The March was led towards the residence of the Leader of Opposition, Shri Rahul Gandhi in New Delhi. The participants at the March included the Union Minister of State - Smt. Raksha Khadse, Senior BJP leaders, sitting Members of Parliament, the Plaintiff and other distinguished members of the Party. Delhi Police intervened and proceeded to detain several participants, including the Plaintiff Ms. Bansuri Swaraj, and Union Minister of State Smt. Raksha Khadse, both of whom cooperated fully and peacefully with the said authorities at all times. While being escorted by police towards the bus at the time of detention, the Plaintiff, in a natural act of solidarity and support, held the hand of her fellow protester, Union Minister of State Smt. Raksha Khadse.

This moment particularly termed herein as the “detention incident” was contemporaneously captured and widely disseminated by credible and authoritative media organisations, including but not limited to Press Trust of India (PTI), ANI, and Aaj Tak. These materials constitute contemporaneous, authentic, and publicly accessible evidence of the events as they unfolded, leaving no scope whatsoever for any reasonable misidentification of any individual as a police officer. Using the raw media footage of the Plaintiff and Smt. Khadse from the detention incident, the Defendant no.1 on 19.04.2026, knowingly, deliberately, maliciously, and with the clear intent to defame, attract unwarranted ridicule, and cause irreparable harm to the reputation of the Plaintiff, published and circulated a video under the scurrilous banner 'Bharatiye Drama Company'/ 'BJP Drama Company' on his verified social media accounts on Instagram-*mlasaurabhgk.official*, X (formerly Twitter) -*@saurabh_MLAgk*, and Facebook. In the said footage, the Defendant no.1 with the clear intention to defame the Plaintiff by misleading the public, superimposed a red circle with the text *“Police officer's hand held intentionally ”* on the footage where the Plaintiff is seen holding the hand of the Union Minister of State - Smt. Raksha Khadse. As an explanation to the Defendant’s false narrative the video is captioned as *“Instead of Police*

Officers taking Nepo-Kid MP, Bansuri Swaraj into detention, it is Nepo-Kid taking Police Officer into detention.”

6. The act of superimposing a red circle and falsely identifying the individual as a “police officer”, when in fact she is a Union Minister, constitutes a deliberate distortion of reality. Defendant no.1 has not merely published a video but has actively engineered a false narrative by combining selective visual framing with a misleading caption and graphical overlays calculated to mislead viewers into believing that the Plaintiff engaged in theatrics by staging a false detention scenario, which is entirely untrue. Defendant no.1 has deliberately created a montage by interspersing footage of the detention incident with graphic overlays, unrelated clips, captions, and meme-style visual inserts, with the clear and calculated intent to distort the true sequence of events and propagate a false and defamatory narrative concerning the Plaintiff, thereby misleading the public at large. The impugned video features a clip of a minor child wholly unrelated to the incident in question, in a manner suggestive of mockery. The clip has been used in a derogatory context, particularly without the knowledge, consent, or authorisation of his parents or lawful guardians. The unauthorised inclusion of a minor’s image in a politicised

and derogatory setting is per se unlawful, violative of the child's privacy and dignity, and reflects the Defendant No.1's reckless disregard for legal and ethical standards.

7. The said Defamatory Content had been published on social media platforms, at the following URLs:

i) Instagram: <https://www.instagram.com/reel/DXUOHcJkmu2/>

ii) Twitter (X): <https://x.com/i/status/2045865618629636425>

iii) Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/share/r/16wdj5jSjv/?mibextid=wwXI>

where the views are of several lakhs of public in general.

8. On 21.04.2026, the Defendant no.2 on his Twitter (X) @AnkushNarang_, Instagram account- ankushnarangaap and Facebook account republished the Defamatory Content originated by Defendant no. 1, with the same caption-

“Bharatiye Drama Company

Instead of Police Officers taking Nepo-Kid MP, Bansuri Swaraj into detention, it is Nepo-Kid taking Police Officer into detention”.

9. The said Defamatory Content has been published on social media platforms, at the following URLs:

i. Twitter: <https://x.com/i/status/2046486103444865160>

ii. Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/share/r/1Cqs1FQRB2/>

iii. Instagram: <https://www.instagram.com/reel/DXYy75DjG6w/?igsh=MzF6d200MmMyYXdh>

10. The said Defamatory Content from the Press Conference has been published by the Defendant No.3 on social media platforms, at the following URLs:

i. YouTube: https://www.youtube.com/live/BlxkWX-StY?si=75_SH6hB6jmJJ_Ez

ii. Twitter: <https://x.com/AAPDelhi/status/2046523053543502262?s=20>

iii. Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/share/r/IE9KWwkLau/>

iv. Instagram: <https://www.instagram.com/reel/DXZaheLEpQZ/?igsh=MWZidjkzdTA5NXJOZg==>

ARGUMENTS ADDRESSED

11. Learned Counsel for Defendants no.1 and 3 in his extensive arguments addressed has vehemently opposed grant of prayer for interim injunction relief to Plaintiff on the following premise. Defendants need reasonable time to verify facts and appropriately respond as though service of summons of the suit and notice to the application was done by email in the afternoon of 22.04.2026 to defendants but physical paper book of case of Plaintiff with a pendrive containing the electronic record documents was received only at 07:30 pm at the office of Defendant no.3 and Counsel had no opportunity to see the videos. Whether as on date there is any alleged offending video on social

Media ? Twitter handle of Defendant no.1 has not been verified for want of existence of alleged offending video as on date. Even the veracity of alleged offending video has not been done and forensic investigation of the same can be done. In fact, Plaintiff wants a gag order ; whereas the interim injunction application is vague lacking specific details even of URLs. Tracking report of notices issued to Defendant no.1 has not been placed on record. Put forth alleged defamatory video are not *ex-facie* defamatory. Pleadings of the Plaintiff are bereft of any averment that Plaintiff was defamed in the eyes of any third person. Damages have not been quantified nor there is any justification put forth for claimed damages of Rs.10 Lakhs. No cause of action is made out against any interim relief claimed against Defendant no.3. Pleadings in the plaint are also bereft of any averment that reputation of Plaintiff was lowered in the eyes of others.

12. Ld. Counsel for Defendant no.1 and 3 also argued that when he checked in Court today from his mobile phone then at Instagram account of Defendant no.1 ; the alleged reel of offending video was not available ; whereas, on the URL of the Twitter account given ; it was popping up on the screen that nothing to see yet. Ld. Counsel for Defendants no.1 and 3 prayed for not to grant any claimed relief to the Plaintiff.

13. In support of his contentions, Ld. Counsel for Defendant no.1 and 3 has relied upon the following precedents :

a) Bloomberg Television Production Services India Private Limited & Ors. Vs. Zee Entertainment Enterprises Limited, 2024 INSC 255.

b) Dr. Shashi Tharoor Vs. Arnab Goswami And Anr., 2017:DHC:7417.

c) Tata Sons Limited Vs. Greenpeace International and Ors., MANU/DE/0220/2011.

d) Arvind Kejriwal & Anr. Vs. State (National Capital Territory of Delhi) & Anr., Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s). 13279/2024 decided on 30.09.2024 by Hon'ble Supreme Court.

14. Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Bloomberg Television Production Services India Private Limited & Ors. Vs. Zee Entertainment Enterprises Limited (supra)*, *inter alia* held that :

“The three-fold test of establishing (i) a prima facie case, (ii) balance of convenience and (iii) irreparable loss or harm, for the grant of interim relief, is well-established in the jurisprudence of this Court. This test is equally applicable to the grant of interim injunctions in defamation suits. However, this three-fold test must not be applied mechanically, to the detriment of the other party and in the case of injunctions against journalistic pieces, often to the detriment of the public. While granting interim relief, the court must provide detailed reasons and analyze how the three-fold test is

satisfied. A cursory reproduction of the submissions and precedents before the court is not sufficient. The court must explain how the test is satisfied and how the precedents cited apply to the facts of the case.”

15. Similar views were expressed in other cited precedents of Ld. Counsel for Defendants no.1 and 3 i.e. ***Dr. Shashi Tharoor (supra) and Tata Sons Limited (supra)***.
16. In the case of ***Tata Sons Limited (supra)*** it was inter alia held by Hon’ble High Court of Delhi that

“...four requirements for liability for defamation, are to be satisfied. The first is a false and defamatory statement must be made about another's reputation or business. What is necessary in a case of defamation is that the statement made is understood by other "of or concerning" the plaintiff. The publication should be made out to a third party. Generally, there is no liability if the defendant did not intend the publication to be viewed by anyone other than the plaintiff. The plaintiff must establish some extent of fault or negligence on the part of the defendant in publishing the statements. A plaintiff who is a public figure will have to show that the statements were made out of malice. The burden of proof is less demanding in case of a private individual. The statements must result in actual or presumed damage.”

17. In the case of ***Arvind Kejriwal (supra)***, the issue was whether the complainant therein or a Political Party would

be covered under the definition of aggrieved person under Section 199 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

18. Ld. Counsel for the Plaintiff vehemently argued for grant of interim relief prayed for, to Plaintiff in terms of application under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 CPC read with Section 151 CPC submitting that the defendants are continuously perpetuating the wrong by circulating and disseminating defamatory contents and if not restrained, it would immensely, adversely prejudice plaintiff causing immense harm to her reputation worldwide. Ld. Counsel for the Plaintiff has also relied upon following precedents :
- a) *Isha Foundation Vs. Google LLC & Ors., 2026:DHC:2393.*
 - b) *Gaurav Bhatia Vs. Naveen Kumar, 2024 SCC OnLine Del 2704.*
 - c) *Vinai Kumar Saxena Vs. Aam Aadmi Party & Ors., (2022) 5 HCC (Del) 662.*
 - d) *Smriti Zubin Irani Vs. Pawan Khera & Ors., 2022 SCC OnLine Del 2310.*
19. In case of *Swatanter Kumar Vs. The Indian Express Ltd. & Ors. 2014 SCC OnLine Del. 210* , it was inter alia held that plaintiff has his right to maintain dignity, right to live dignified life, right to preserve reputation and they are all facets of right to life as provided under Article 21 and also parts of basic human rights which are fundamental rights

and legally enforceable rights. Also was held that freedom of expression in press and media is the part of Article 19(1) of the Constitution of India where by all the citizens have a right to express their view. However, the said right of the expression is also not absolute but is subjected to the reasonable restrictions imposed by the Parliament or State in the interests of the sovereignty and integrity of India, the security of the State, friendly relations with foreign States, public order, decency or morality or in relation to contempt of Court, defamation or incitement to an offence. The said position is clear from the plain reading of the Article 19(1) and (2) of the Constitution of India.

20. In case of *Express Newspapers Pvt. Ltd. & Ors vs. Union Of India*, AIR 1986 SC 872, the Supreme Court emphasized that though the freedom of press is an inalienable right, but the same is not absolute and is subject to Article 19 (2) as uncontrolled right to speech leads to anarchism. The Supreme Court inter alia observed :

“... however precious and cherished the freedom of speech is under Art.19(1)(a), this freedom is not absolute and unlimited at all times and under all circumstances but is subject to the restrictions contained in Art. 19(2). That must be so because unrestricted freedom of speech and expression which includes the freedom of the press and is wholly free from restraints, amounts to uncontrolled licence

which would lead to disorder and anarchy and it would be hazardous to ignore the vital importance of our social and national interest in public order and security of the State.”

21. In case of ***Reliance Petrochemicals Ltd vs. Proprietors Of Indian Express, AIR 1989 SC 190***, the Hon’ble Supreme Court observed that the Court can pass interim orders restraining the publication if the Court finds that there exists a real and imminent danger that the continuance of the publication would result in interference with the administration of justice.
22. Hon’ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Sahara India Real Estate Corporation Limited and Others vs. Securities and Exchange Board of India & Another, (2012) 10 SCC 603*** also proceeded to observe that the postponement of publication orders can be passed by the Court after seeing the publication and no general orders restraining future publications can be made but the Court will adopt a judicious approach while making the orders of postponements after the considering the material available on record.
23. **What constitutes an offending publication would depend on the decision of the Court on case to case basis.**
24. In view of the observations of the Supreme Court, it is clear that the order in the cases preventing the publication

may include directions to postpone the publication amongst other directions.

25. It is a well settled law that the right to free speech cannot mean that a citizen can defame the other. The protection of reputation is a fundamental right and also a human right and cumulatively serves the social interest. The infringement of the right to reputation may result into civil as well as criminal action. The fair comment implies making of a genuine effort to reach truth and a mere belief of there being truth without there being reasonable grounds for such plea is not synonymous with fair comment. It is also the duty of the printer / publisher to act with due care and caution. A person is entitled to be treated with dignity. He has right of social reputation as an ordinary citizen. Even if he be a public figure and as reputation is a cherished value and an element of personal security.
26. Ld. Counsel for Defendants no.1 and 3 argued that granting any relief of injunction at this stage would amount to decreeing the suit. This argument is fallacious on the face of it since injunction is to preventing harm in future and not to redress the past deed.
27. The defamatory and libellous content published by the Defendant, as detailed in plaint, constitute a malicious attack upon the unblemished reputation and good name of the Plaintiff with the intention to launch a smear campaign

on social media and lower the reputation of the Plaintiff in the society.

28. As per pleadings of Plaintiff ; present Suit For Declaration, Permanent And Mandatory Injunction, Damages arises from the publication of a video featuring the Plaintiff, along with false and misleading captions pertaining to a detention incident initially posted and disseminated by Defendant No. 1 on 19.04.2026 across multiple social media platforms, and thereafter reproduced and further propagated by Defendant No.2 on 20.04.2026. The defamatory narrative was subsequently amplified and lent institutional endorsement through statements made by Defendant No.1 at a press conference organised by Defendant No.3 on 21.04.2026, which were again widely circulated across various online platforms. The Plaintiff seeks, inter alia, declarations that the said publications, reproductions, and statements are tortious and defamatory in nature; mandatory injunctions directing the Defendants to take down and permanently remove the impugned content; permanent injunctions restraining further circulation of such defamatory material; as well as appropriate directions for issuance of public apologies and payment of damages for the grave and irreparable harm caused to the Plaintiffs reputation, dignity, and public standing.

29. As per case of Plaintiff, during the said press conference, the Defendant no.1 proceeded to repeat, aggravate, and compound the original defamatory imputations by once again describing the events of the detention incident of 18th April, 2026, and by again falsely and contemptuously referring to Smt. Raksha Khadse, the Union Minister of State, as a “police officer.” The Defendant made the following statements in Hindi :

“Nepo Kids ko pata nah hota ki police kaise pakadti hai, kaise bus ki gaadi mein daalti hai, thaane mein daalti hai. Toh Bansuri Swaraj petIte hi bhaag ti bus ki taraf. Police watt piche reb gayi. Pata chala saamne tv ke camera hain toh aisa laga main hi bhaag ke bus mein chadh jaungi, toh poore ke poore samaj ke andar chhichaledar ho jayegi. Toll urlhone police wah ka haath pakda aar police wah Bansuri ko nah, Bansuri police wah ko detain karke bus mein le gayi.”

30. Ld. Counsel for the Plaintiff has stated that the plain, natural, and unmistakable meaning of the aforesaid statements is that the Plaintiff, deliberately staged and fabricated her own detention by seizing the hand of a police officer for the cameras, and that the Plaintiff in fact detained the police officer and not the other way around an imputation, that is not only demonstrably false but calculated to expose the Plaintiff to public ridicule,

contempt, and scorn in the highest degree. In the course of the said press conference, the Defendant no.1 repeatedly and contemptuously referred to the Plaintiff as a “Nepo-Kid,” a derogatory expression deployed to denigrate the Plaintiff as an undeserving beneficiary of her late mother’s legacy, thereby making a malicious, personal, and wholly unwarranted attack upon the Plaintiffs professional standing, integrity, and individual merit. In summation, the actions of the Defendants constitute a clear and sustained act of defamation: firstly, the Defamatory Content, along with its subsequent explanation before the press, falsely portrays the Plaintiff as a dishonest, theatrical, and manipulative public representative who staged her own detention for political effect, thereby exposing her to public ridicule, contempt, and hatred, and lowering her in the estimation of right-thinking members of society; secondly, the Defamatory Content specifically attributes to the Plaintiff a false act namely, holding the hand of a purported police officer with theatrical intent, which is demonstrably untrue and constitutes a false statement of fact; thirdly, the said Defamatory Content has been widely published and disseminated by the Defendants across their verified social media platforms, including Instagram, X (formerly Twitter), and Facebook, garnering substantial viewership, shares, and engagement, thereby ensuring its

circulation to millions of persons in India and abroad, in fact through words spoken in the Press Conference on 21.04.2026 organized by Defendant No.3, the Defendant No.1 has deliberately propagated the Defamatory Content to the public at large which has been endorsed and publicised by Defendant No.3 ; fourthly, the falsity of the imputation stands conclusively established, as the individual in question is Smt. Raksha Khadse, a sitting Union Minister of State, as clearly borne out from raw footage published by credible national media platforms; and lastly, the Defendants, being seasoned politicians, and a national political party, were either fully aware of the falsity of the imputation or acted with reckless disregard for the truth by publishing the same without any verification, both of which constitute actionable fault in law.

31. During the course of arguments, alleged defamatory content in pendrive placed by the Plaintiff through Counsel in paper book on record has been seen on computer of the Court, by all in attendance.
32. Accordingly, Plaintiff has been able to set up a prima facie case in her favour. Even in the course of hearing, Ld. Counsel for the Plaintiff from his mobile phone had shown from the Twitter account of Defendants no.1 and 3, the video shared by Defendant no.1 as well as the part of the

Press Conference published by Defendant no.3 on social media to be also existing on social platform as on date.

33. In the instant case, the reputation of the Plaintiff is at stake. Reputation of the Plaintiff would suffer irreparable harm if injunctions as prayed for are not granted as she would suffer further loss to her reputation. The right of reputation of a living individual under Article 21 of the Constitution of India cannot be sacrificed and crucified at the altar of the right of freedom of speech and expression of another and both have to be harmonised and balanced in as much as no amount of damages can redeem the damage to reputation of any person.
34. Accordingly, irreparable loss and injury would be caused to Plaintiff if the aforesaid defamatory content is allowed to remain in the public domain. No harm would be caused to Defendants if the defamatory contents is restrained from remaining in public domain atleast till the next date of hearing ; since the said defamatory contents have a potential of bringing disrespect to the Plaintiff with practical damage to her reputation. Therefore, the irreparable loss would be caused to the Plaintiff in case the injunction as sought by Plaintiff is not granted.
35. Balance of convenience also lies in favour of the Plaintiff. By making a defamatory content made available on public platform, would not, in any way, infringe on the rights of

defendants of freedom of speech and expression which they can in any case, exercise within the defined parameters.

36. In view of the foregoing discussions, **the Defendants are accordingly restrained from continuing to publish, host, uploading / circulating / reposting or disseminating the defamatory content in video dated 19.04.2026 and the defamatory content in press conference dated 21.04.2026 on Instagram, X (formerly Twitter), Facebook, YouTube or any other social media platform or digital medium as well as to forth with take down and remove the same from all such social media platforms and to postpone publications of said defamatory content from all social media platforms, till the next date of hearing.**
37. **In the event of non compliance of any part / full order / directions by any or all of Defendants within 48 hours ; then Plaintiff can present digitally signed internet downloaded copy of this order to authorized officials of social media platforms including Instagram, X (Formerly Twitter), Facebook, YouTube to take down aforesaid elicited defamatory content, till the next date of hearing.**

Written statement by filed by the Defendants in 30 days time period ; after supply of its copy to opposite party before the next date of hearing.

Defendants may also file reply to application under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 CPC read with Section 151 CPC in 15 days time period.

Fixed 13.05.2026 for further hearing on application under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 CPC read with Section 151 CPC and its disposal.

Digitally signed copy of this order be given dasti to parties to the *lis* and be uploaded on the website.

(Gurvinder Pal Singh)
Principal District & Sessions Judge (South)
Saket Courts, New Delhi (*ab*)