

**(2025) 12 DEL CK 0012**

**Delhi HC**

**Case No:** Civil Miscellaneous Petition No. 2383 Of 2025, Civil Miscellaneous Application Nos. 77374, 77375 Of 2025

Ravinder Yadav

APPELLANT

Vs

Deepak Yadav & Anr.

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision:** Dec. 8, 2025

**Acts Referred:**

- Constitution of India, 1950- Article 227
- Code of Civil Procedure, 1908- Section 151, Order 7 Rule 14

**Hon'ble Judges:** Girish Kathpalia, J

**Bench:** Single Bench

**Final Decision:** Dismissed

---

### **Judgement**

Girish Kathpalia, J

1. Petitioner/plaintiff has assailed order dated 20.11.2025 of the learned trial court, whereby his application under Section 151 CPC was dismissed with cost and his other application under Order VII Rule 14 CPC was allowed subject to cost.

2. Petitioner/plaintiff has appeared in person and at the outset, he was offered adjournment so that he could engage a counsel, be it a private counsel or a legal aid counsel. But the petitioner/plaintiff rejected the offer, contending that he wants to address in person only. As such, I heard the petitioner/plaintiff.

3. The application under Section 151 CPC, which got dismissed by way of the impugned order is at pdf 159, forming part of Annexure R-19 and the same is titled: "APPLICATION ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF UNDER SECTION 151 CPC FOR OBJECTING TO THE ADJOURNMENT DATED 01.02.2025 SOUGHT BY DEFENDANT'S COUNSEL MR. VIKAS TANWAR AND BY DEEPAK YADAV ON 17.07.2025 IN COURT NO.6 ON FALSE GROUNDS". It appears from the impugned order that on being called upon to address on the application, the petitioner/plaintiff submitted that he is not able to tell the contents

thereof, which made the learned trial court believe that the application was false and frivolous, so the application was dismissed with cost of Rs. 2,000/-.

4. It is submitted by the petitioner/plaintiff that he had tried to explain but the learned trial court did not hear him. No other submission has been advanced. In view of the specific judicial order, I find no reason to believe what the petitioner/plaintiff is saying today. Rather, the manner and content of the subject application conveys that the same was drafted by some advocate. In the recent past, it has been observed that some of the advocates when finding it difficult to address in support of their application or petition, draft the same and make the litigant appear in person. Be that as it may, I am unable to find any infirmity, much less perversity in the impugned order, so far as the dismissal of application under Section 151 CPC is concerned.

5. As regards the other application of petitioner/plaintiff, the same was under Order VII Rule 14 CPC for permission to place on record additional documents and the same was allowed subject to cost of Rs. 500/- towards cost of delay in filing those documents. Even this part of the impugned order cannot be interfered with under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

6. In view of the aforesaid, the present petition is found not just devoid of merit but completely frivolous, so the petition is dismissed with cost of Rs. 10,000/- to be deposited by the petitioner/plaintiff with the Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee within one week. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

7. A copy of this order be sent to the trial court for information.