

IN THE COURT OF SH. BHARAT AGGARWAL, CIVIL
JUDGE, DELHI (WEST)-02
SUIT NO.9957/2016

Sh. Mukesh Sharma

.....Plaintiff

Versus

Sh. Naveen Sharma

.....Defendant

THROUGH CISCO WEBEX VIDEO CONFERENCING

Date:18/06/2020 (3.05 P.M to 3.20 P.M)

Present:- Sh. Harshit Jain, Ld. Counsel for plaintiff. (Mobile No.9971390547- E-mail ID of Sh. Harshit Jain: advharshitjain@gmail.com)

Sh. Anurag Bindal, Ld. Counsel for defendant. (Mobile No.9999955947- E-mail ID of Sh. Anurag Bindal: anuragbindal@gmail.com)

1. Matter was taken up through video conferencing. During the video conferencing, the audio and video of the counsel for plaintiff was not clear and, therefore, submissions of the counsel for plaintiff could not be heard.


The Reader of this court tried to repeatedly contact the counsel for the plaintiff telephonically but he could not be heard for the video

conferencing proceedings and therefore, effectively the arguments could not be heard.

2. Perusal of the record reflects that no response to the application filed by the plaintiff u/O VII R.14 CPC has been filed by the defendant. Let the soft copy of the application u/O VII R.14 CPC along with documents be provided to the counsel for the defendant through email. The defendant shall file the response to the application at least a week before the next date of hearing after supplying the advance copy to the other side. Counsel for defendant is also directed to clarify the details of the inadequate stamp duty on the agreement to sell relied upon by the Plaintiff on the next date of hearing.

Put up for arguments on the application u/O VII R.14 CPC filed by the plaintiff and clarification on application u/s 33 of Indian Stamp Act filed by the defendant, on 01/09/2020.

A copy of this order be sent to the Ld. Counsel for Plaintiff and Defendants and also to the filing/computer branch of Tis Hazari Court, Delhi.


Bharat Aggarwal
C.J-02, West, THC, Delhi
dt.18/06/2020