



2025:DHC:10198



\$~24 to 27

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

% *Date of Decision: 19.11.2025*

+ **CM(M) 103/2023 & CM APPL. 3383/2023**

NEELU CHAWLAPetitioner

Through: Mr. Aryan Bhardwaj, Advocate

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Sumedha Dua, Advocate for R2
Mr. S.K. Gandhi and Mr. Aman
Kumar Yadav, Advocates for R5-7

25

+ **CM(M) 104/2023 & CM APPL. 3421/2023**

NEELU CHAWLAPetitioner

Through: Mr. Aryan Bhardwaj, Advocate

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Sumedha Dua, Advocate for R2
Mr. S.K. Gandhi and Mr. Aman
Kumar Yadav, Advocates for R5

26

+ **CM(M) 196/2023 & CM APPL. 6069/2023**

RANJU SAYALLPetitioner

Through: Mr. Aryan Bhardwaj, Advocate

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents



2025:DHC:10198



Through: Ms. Sumedha Dua, Advocate for R2
Mr. S.K. Gandhi and Mr. Aman
Kumar Yadav, Advocates for R5-7

27

+

CM(M) 197/2023 & CM APPL. 6071/2023

RANJU SAYALL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aryan Bhardwaj, Advocate

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Sumedha Dua, Advocate for R2
Mr. S.K. Gandhi and Mr. Aman
Kumar Yadav, Advocates for R5

CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA**ORDER (ORAL)**

1. Adjournment requested by counsel for petitioners on the ground that grandmother of the arguing counsel Mr. Karan Nagrath has suffered heart attack. Learned counsel for respondents strongly opposed the adjournment request, pointing out that there are multiple advocates appearing on behalf of petitioners and Mr. Karan Nagrath, Advocate is not the arguing counsel. Learned counsel for respondents also contended that the arguing counsel is deliberately avoiding appearance to somehow get these matters adjourned.

2. By way of the orders impugned in these petitions, request of the present petitioners to examine their witnesses through videoconferencing was declined. By way of order dated 08.02.2023, the learned predecessor



2025:DHC:10198



bench stayed the operation of the impugned orders making a reference to the Delhi High Court Rules for Video Conferencing, 2021.

3. After some discussion, learned counsel for respondents on instructions in the interest of expeditious disposal of the main proceedings submits that with consent, the impugned orders may be set aside, permitting examination of the witnesses of the present petitioners through videoconferencing strictly in accordance with the abovementioned Rules.

4. Besides, it is also contended by learned counsel for respondents that costs imposed on the present petitioners by the trial court remain not paid till date. So far as the issue of costs is concerned, in view of law on Section 35B CPC elaborated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Manohar Singh vs D.S. Sharma**, Civil Appeal 7554-7555 of 2009 out of SLP(C) 2203-2204 of 2008 decided on 13.11.2009, the trial court shall ensure that the entire outstanding costs are paid within one week from today.

5. In view of above discussion, with consent of both sides, the orders impugned in these petitions are set aside and it is directed that the witnesses of the present petitioners may be examined through videoconferencing strictly in accordance with the Delhi High Court Rules for Video Conferencing, 2021 as expeditiously as possible. It is also made clear that in case the costs mentioned above are not paid, learned trial court shall pass appropriate orders in accordance with the law cited above.



2025:DHC:10198



6. Accordingly, all these petitions and the accompanying applications stand disposed of.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

NOVEMBER 19, 2025/as