

\$~4(SB), 3(SB), 5(SB), 6(SB), 7(SB) & 14 to 39 & 43 to 45

Date of Decision: 20th May, 2022

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **FAO 36/2021 & CM APPLs.2914/2021, 10442/2021, 10444/2021, 20904/2021, 23819/2021, 25868/2021, 25869/2021, 25870/2021, 25884/2021, 25885/2021, 26495/2021, 29121/2021, 38063/2021, 38289/2021, 39643/2021, 43944-46/2021, 3172/2022, 3455/2022, 5641/2022, 5642/2022, 5803/2022, 5865/2022, 7745/2022, 13472/2022, 16153/2022, 17039/2022, 18207/2022, 18247/2022, 18248/2022, 21768/2022, 21801/2022, 21802/2022, 21803/2022, 22125/2022, 23093/2022**
NEETA BHARDWAJ & ORS. Appellants
versus
KAMLESH SHARMA Respondent
With
+ **CM (M) 323/2021 & CM APPL. 14178/2021, 20945/2021, 20949/2021, 40269/2021**
+ **CM (M) 575/2021 & CM APPL. 29013-14/2021, 43796-97/2021, 19915/2022**
+ **CONT.CAS(C) 614/2021**
+ **RSA 109/2018 & CM APPLs.30168/2018, 70/2019**
+ **CS (OS) 55/2022**
+ **CS (OS) 56/2022**
+ **CS (OS) 57/2022**
+ **CS (OS) 511/2021**
+ **CS (OS) 512/2021**
+ **CS (OS) 518/2021**
+ **CS (OS) 520/2021**
+ **CS (OS) 521/2021**
+ **CS (OS) 526/2021 & I.A. 7511/2022**
+ **CS (OS) 527/2021 & I.As.1717-18/2022**
+ **CS (OS) 533/2021 & I.As.1721-22/2022**
+ **CS (OS) 535/2021 & I.A. 7552/2022**
+ **CS (OS) 538/2021 & I.As.1725-26/2022**
+ **CS (OS) 539/2021**
+ **CS (OS) 540/2021 & I.A. 7940/2022**
+ **CS (OS) 541/2021 & I.As.1723-24/2022**
+ **CS (OS) 542/2021**
+ **CS (OS) 544/2021 & I.As.1719-20/2022**

- + **CS (OS) 545/2021**
- + **CS (OS) 546/2021**
- + **CS (OS) 547/2021 & I.As.1715-16/2022**
- + **CS (OS) 552/2021 & I.As. 16148-49/2021**
- + **CS (OS) 554/2021**
- + **CS (OS) 579/2021**
- + **CS (OS) 588/2021 & I.A. 6019/2022**
- + **CS (OS) 648/2021**
- + **CS (OS) 2499/2010**
- + **CS (OS) 641/2005 & I.As. 19445/2014, 24296/2015**
- + **CS (OS) 642/2005 & I.As. 19847/2012, 16501/2014, 16502/2014, 19512/2014, 2234/2015, 24297/2015**

Appearances:-

- Mr. Rohit K. Naagpal and Mr. Dipanshu Gaba, Advocates in FAO 36/2021. (M:9873730191)
- Mr. R. K. Bhardwaj, Advocate for Appellant in FAO 36/2021. (M:9312710547)
- Mr. Kush Bhardwaj, Advocate. (M:9891074686)
- Mr. Luv Bhardwaj, Advocate. (M:9990693140)
- Ms. Samapika Biswal and Ms. Shambhavi Kala, Advocates. (M:9818668876)
- Mr. Thakur Sumit, Advocate for Defendants in CS (OS) 588/2021 & Petitioner in CM (M) 323/2021. (M:9968454481)
- Mr. Neeraj Bhardwaj, Advocate for Mr. Vipul Gaur. (M:9350271061)
- Mr. Sarvesh Bhardwaj, Advocate for Plaintiffs/LRs/Defendants (M:9350301058).
- Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Dubey, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Rajmangal Kumar, Advocate for Applicants in CM Nos.18207/2022 & 17247/2022. (M:9871211544)
- Mr. Arun Birbal, Mr. Sanjay Singh, Ms. Sonia Singhani and Ms. Vidhi Gupta Advocates for DDA. (M:9958118327)
- Mr. Siddharth Panda, Standing Counsel for SDMC. (M:9891488088)
- Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Advocate. (M:866910977)
- Mr. Nitin Jain, Mr. Vishal Chauhan, Ms. Komal Jain, Mr. Rishabh Singhal and Ms. Kavita Singh, Advocates for Shopkeepers. (M:9716569056)
- Mr. Prabhas Chandra, Advocate for D-2. (M:9871254033)
- Ms. K. Kiran, Advocate. (M:9818893995)
- Mr. Anuj Chaturvedi, Advocate for DUSIB.
- Mr. Kamal Mehta, Advocate.
- Mr. Jameel Ahemad, Advocate. (M:9810961212)

Mr. Goonmeet Singh Chauhan, Architect.
Inspector Balbir Singh, SHO/Kalkaji and SI Manu Dev PS Kalkaji in person.
Mr. Adithya Nair, Advocate for Mr. Gautam Narayan, for GNCTD.
(M:8007515131)
Mr. Sunil Fernandes, SC BSES-RPL with Mr. Shubham Sharma, Advocates.
Mr. Anurag Ahluwalia, CGSC with Mr. Shubham Gupta & Mr. Rishab
Narayan, Advocates. (M:9811418995)
Mr. Anunaya Mehta and Mr. Vinayak Thakur, Advocates. (M:9013008939)
Mr. Rajesh Ranjan Singh & Ms. Preeti Chaudhary, Advocates.
Mr. Lokesh Bhardwaj, General Secretary for SKMPSC
(maakalkamandir@gmail.com)(M:9205084060)
Mr. Kaoliangpou Kamei & Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate. (M:9899754667)
Mr. Prashant Manchanda, ASC (Civil), GNCTD in FAO 36/2021.

CORAM:
JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH

Prathiba M. Singh, J. (Oral)

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. These matters pertain to the *Kalkaji Mandir*, which this Court has been hearing from time to time. These are part-heard matters.
3. Vide previous order dated 27th September, 2021, Ms. Manmeet Arora was appointed as Assistant to the Id. Administrator. The relevant paragraph of the said order is set out below:

*“107. **The Id. Administrator shall be assisted by Ms. Manmeet Arora**, who has been appointed as the Local Commissioner by this Court in these cases, from time to time, and has submitted various reports on the condition of the Kalkaji Mandir. The Id. Administrator may appoint a Secretary-cum Treasurer to assist him in carrying out his mandate and day-to-day functioning.”*

4. The said Id. Counsel who had been appointed as the Assistant to the Id. Administrator, has since been elevated as a Judge of this Court.

Accordingly, Ms. Samapika Biswal, Id. Counsel who has been working with the erstwhile counsel, Ms. Arora, and who has also been assisting the Id. Administrator on a continuous basis and appearing before the Court on behalf of the Id. Administrator, is appointed as the Assistant to the Id. Administrator. Considering the standing of Ms. Biswal, Id. Counsel, her payment is fixed at Rs.75,000/- per month, instead of Rs.1,50,000/- per month which was earlier fixed, payable in the same manner as that of the erstwhile Assistant *mutatis mutandis*.

5. At the outset, it is noted that as recorded in the previous order dated 13th May, 2022, Id. Counsels appearing for the *pujaris* who were the petitioners before the Supreme Court in *SLP No.9073/2022* titled *Nathi Ram Bhardwaj & Ors. v. Neeta Bhardwaj & Ors.* and the Division Bench in *LPA No.172/2022* titled *Vinayak Bhardwaj v. Neeta Bhardwaj*, and of various *baridaars* and *pujaris* had clearly and unequivocally submitted that they support the redevelopment of the *Kalkaji Mandir* fully. However, they ought to be allowed to participate in the redevelopment process and give their suggestions and recommendations to the Id. Administrator and the Architect. The Court had accordingly directed them to give their suggestions and the said process is already underway before the Id. Administrator. The relevant extract of the said order dated 13th May, 2022, reads as under:

“8. Going forward, the submission of Mr. Vikas Singh, Id. Senior Counsel and Mr. Rakesh Bhardwaj, Id. Counsel, appearing for the pujaris who were the petitioners before the Supreme Court in SLP No.9073/2022 titled Nathi Ram Bhardwaj & Ors. v. Neeta Bhardwaj & Ors. and the Division Bench in LPA No.172/2022 titled Vinayak Bhardwaj v. Neeta Bhardwaj, and of various baaridars and pujaris is that

they support the redevelopment of Kalkaji Mandir fully, however, in the redevelopment process, the baaridars and the pujaris ought to be allowed to participate and give their suggestions and recommendations to the Id. Administrator and the Architect. Their submission is that the role of the Pujaris and the Dharamshala occupants ought to be acknowledged and some part of the redevelopment ought to account for their interests as well.

9. In view of the submissions made by the Dharamshala occupants and the pujaris today, they are permitted to appear before the Id. Administrator at a suitable time and date fixed by the Id. Administrator in order to enable them to give their suggestions/recommendations/proposals to the Id. Administrator in respect of the redevelopment. During this meeting, it is made clear that the concerns of the Id. Administrator regarding the waiting rooms for devotees and proper arrangements of food and water, shall be kept in mind while discussing the redevelopment with pujaris and dharamshala occupants. The Id. Architect shall be present in such meetings.”

6. This Court has been informed by the Ld. Administrator that the first of such meetings has been conducted by the Id. Administrator on 18th May, 2022. As per the Minutes of Meeting dated 18th May 2022 placed on record by the Ld. Administrator, the *pujaris* were apprised of the requirements of the devotees that needs to be taken into consideration for redevelopment. The *pujaris* were then invited to submit their suggestions in writing along with a layout plan to the Ld. Administrator. The said Minutes are set out below:

**“MINUTES OF THE MEETING WITH THE
PUJARIS DATED 18.05.2022**

1. The undersigned convened a meeting with the

Pujaris of the Kalkaji Mandir pursuant to the order dated 13.05.2022 passed by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court at 3:30 PM in the Mandir Complex to invite suggestions/recommendations/proposals from the Pujaris in respect of the redevelopment of the Mandir Complex. The attendance sheet is annexed along with the Minutes.

2. The undersigned informed the Pujaris that the Kalkaji Mandir receives the highest footfall of devotees in Delhi and that presently, the Mandir Complex is able to accommodate only 1500 persons at a time. The rest of the devotees are forced to stand on the road and wait for hours without any arrangements. The undersigned further informed the Pujaris that the re-development plan as prepared will require certain modifications as the demarcation report provided by the SDM's office of the year 2012 indicates that the Mandir Complex land is 17-18 acres, whereas the earlier re-development plan is for 12 acres of land.

3. The undersigned suggested that in the re-development plan, there should be arrangements for the followings:

- (a) Temple office, bank, medical center;
- (b) Pooja shops;
- (c) Rooms/halls for storage of Pooja items and resting for Baridaars;
- (d) Bhojanalya and Bhandara sthall;
- (e) Auditorium halls for holding satsang, kirthan sthall and for holding functions like mundan, birthdays, celebrations etc.;
- (f) Waiting hall for the devotees;
- (g) Waterfalls, parks, parking;
- (h) Dharamshalas for the devotees.

4. The undersigned invited all the Pujaris to submit their suggestions in writing along with a layout plan to the office of the undersigned.

5. Accordingly, the Architect was requested to provide a rough layout plan to the office of the undersigned to

be circulated to the Pujaris within one week. The Pujaris requested that they be given 30 days' time to submit their suggestions. However, the time suggested appears to be on the higher side. Accordingly, the Pujaris were given 15 days' time after the layout plan to be circulated by the Architect to submit their suggestions.”

7. In terms of the above Minutes, the layout plan is to be given to the *pujaris*. Ms. Biswal, Id. Counsel, also submits that the layout plan of the *Kalkaji Mandir* along with the AutoCAD drawings is being provided to the *pujaris/baridaars* today.

8. Some of the Id. Counsels appearing for the *baridaars* and *pujaris* have expressed that they would like to have regular meetings with the Id. Administrator in order to participate in the redevelopment process effectively, as also for giving suggestions, etc. with respect to the running of the *Kalkaji Mandir*.

9. It is clear that the redevelopment of the *Kalkaji Mandir* can commence only if all persons who are in occupation of the *dharamshalas*, vacate the premises which are in their occupation. Accordingly, since the occupants of the *dharamshalas* are either *pujaris/baridaars*, considering the stand of the *pujaris* and *baridaars* that they support the redevelopment, this Court deems it fit to issue the following directions:

- (i) With regard to the vacation of the premises of the *Kalkaji Mandir*, in the interest of redevelopment, as also, basis the submissions of the counsels recorded in the previous order dated 13th May, 2022, the *pujaris/baridaars* who are occupying the *dharamshalas* shall make

submissions before this Court concerning the timelines of such vacation on 1st June, 2022. On the said date, this Court would direct the final vacation of the *dharamshala* premises by all occupants. If any party wishes to make any submissions in this regard, they shall do so on 1st June, 2022.

(ii) The *pujaris/baridaars* shall submit their suggestions with regard to the redevelopment, to the Id. Administrator within 15 days of obtaining the layout plan. Pursuant to the same, such parties shall appear before the Id. Administrator on 4th June, 2022 at 5 P.M., by which time all the suggestions of the *pujaris/baridaars* shall be submitted. On the said date, the Id. Administrator would consider the suggestions given with respect to the redevelopment of the *Kalkaji Mandir*.

(iii) The Id. Administrator shall also have interactions with the *pujaris/baridaars* and shall submit a report to this Court by 4th July, 2022, after considering their submissions.

(iv) Additionally, going forward, after 4th July, 2022, in order to assuage the concerns of the *pujaris/baridaars*, etc., the Id. Administrator shall meet with them at least once every fortnight, so that in the general functioning of the *Kalkaji Mandir* as also the redevelopment, the *pujaris* and *baridaars* can submit their suggestions to the Id. Administrator, which can be duly considered.

10. It is also noted that the order dated 27th April, 2022 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Kalkaji Mandir Vikryata Sangathan-II & Ors. v. Piyush Joshi & Ors. [SLP No.32452-32453/2013, decided on 27th April, 2022]* and all other connected matters, has been placed on record by Mr.

Lokesh Bhardwaj, Id. Counsel.

Construction of Temporary Shops

11. Vide Report No.6, the Id. Administrator has reported that the total number of allottees who have paid the cost of construction of Rs.30,000/- and whose credentials have been verified for allotment of temporary shops in the *Kalkaji Mandir* premises, now stands at 115, including 15 *pujaris* and 100 shopkeepers.

12. Pursuant to the notice issued vide previous order dated 13th May, 2022, Mr. Sunil Fernandes, Id. Standing Counsel has entered appearance on behalf of BSES Rajdhani Power Limited (*hereinafter "BSES"*). In the larger public interest and for the commencement of the process of erection of temporary shops, BSES shall consider providing temporary connection in the name of the Id. Administrator of the *Kalkaji Mandir*, as soon as possible.

13. Accordingly, for the said purpose, the officials of BSES shall meet the Id. Administrator on **23rd May, 2022**. A list of outstanding dues of BSES, if any, be also submitted to the Id. Administrator.

14. Mr. Fernandes submits that he would file an affidavit placing on record the stand of the BSES in this regard. Let the said affidavit be filed and placed on record by BSES before the next date of hearing i.e., 1st June, 2022.

Allotment of 16 Larger Temporary Shops to be erected

15. Vide order dated 25th April, 2022, this Court has directed as under:

"18. Accordingly, all the applicants who wish to bid for the larger shops are permitted to submit their best bids/offers for the cost of construction as also for the monthly tehbazari amounts. The Id. Administrator shall consider all the applications for the larger shops

and shall place the list before this Court as to the bids which are submitted and his recommendations in respect of which of the persons would be entitled for the allotment of the larger shops and on what terms, in his next report. Accordingly, all the applicants who intend to seek allotment of the 16 larger shops are permitted to submit their bids along with their credentials and documents to the Id. Administrator on or before 6th May, 2022.

19. For the allotment of the temporary large shops, the offers of pujaris as also any dharamshala occupants and all the shopkeepers who earlier had shops in the Kalkaji Mandir premises, as on the date of the order of this Court dated 27th September, 2021, would be permitted to submit their offers.”

16. In respect of the above direction, Report No.6 of the Id. Administrator has been perused. As per the said Report, the bids for the 16 larger shops have been taken only from those persons who had shops in the *Kalkaji Mandir* premises, as on the date of the order dated 27th September, 2021 passed by this Court.

17. It is clarified that paragraph 19 of the order dated 25th April, 2022 extracted hereinabove, categorizes two kinds of offers - the first category being the offer of *pujaris* and *dharamshala* occupants, and the second category being the shopkeepers who earlier had shops in the *Kalkaji Mandir* premises as on the date of the order dated 27th September, 2021 passed by this Court. The Id. Administrator has placed on record a chart of the eligible applicants only belonging to the second category.

18. Accordingly, all such persons falling in the first category as described above i.e., the *pujaris* and *dharamshala* occupants, who wish to submit their bids to the Id. Administrator, *qua* the 16 larger shops, shall do so, on or

before 25th May, 2022. The said bids shall be placed on record in a tabulated form on or before the next date of hearing i.e., 1st June, 2022.

19. On behalf of the *jhuggi* dwellers, a submission has been made by Mr. Kaoliangpou Kamei, Id. Counsel that the *jhuggi* dwellers ought to be permitted to make payment of the consideration in respect of the EWS and LIG flats, in terms of the order dated 15th March, 2022, in instalments. Vide order dated 15th March, 2022, for the purposes of rehabilitation of the *jhuggi* dwellers, after hearing DUSIB/DDA, the following directions were issued:-

“5. Considering that all the occupants may not have adequate financial means, a proposal was directed to be placed on record for further directions as to the manner in which the said persons could be rehabilitated. The proposal which has been placed before the Court is as under:

(i) The jhuggis of the Kalkaji Mandir premises, as per the revenue record, are located on a private land. Therefore, strictly speaking, the people living in said jhuggis are not entitled to rehabilitation under the Delhi Slum & JJ Rehabilitation and Relocation Policy, 2015.

(ii) That as directed in the previous order dated 7th March, 2022, since the purpose for which the land has been used is a public purpose i.e., for the deity of the Kalkaji Mandir and in the larger public interest, as an exceptional situation and under directions of the Court, certain proposals have been made set out, as below.

(a) EWS flats under the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (hereinafter “JNNURM”) scheme may be provided to the ‘urban poor’ on a rental basis, however, rehabilitation permanently would not be permissible under the said scheme as per the current policy of the

Central Government.

(b) DDA is willing to make available EWS and LIG flats in Narela, the cost of which is between Rs.10.75 lakhs to 12.05 lakhs for EWS category and Rs.18 lakhs to Rs.22 lakhs for LIG category.

(iii) In case none of these options are acceptable to the occupants, DUSIB may provide the occupants temporary night shelters / rain basera until they make their own alternative arrangements.”

20. The Ld. Administrator had, thereafter, reported that none of the *jhuggi* dwellers were inclined to avail of any of the options given to them and accordingly, the said *jhuggi* dwellers were evicted. Now, the stand of some of the *jhuggi* dwellers is that some of them wish to purchase the flats in question, but instalment payments ought to be permitted. Accordingly, it is directed that if any of the *jhuggi* dwellers wish to make any payments in instalments towards the consideration in respect of the said flats, they may make a representation to the DDA and provide a copy of the same to the Administrator. It is up to the DDA to consider the same as per its own policy.

Unauthorized Occupants of Jhuggis and Dharamshalas

21. Insofar as the occupants of *Salig Ram Kayastha Dharamshala* are concerned, it is noticed that the same has not been vacated yet. Ld. Counsels for the *pujaris/baridaars* unanimously submit that the occupants therein have not been given protection by any Court, and are also not covered by the orders passed by the Division Bench of this Court or the Supreme Court. In view thereof, the Ld. Administrator and concerned SHO, P.S. Kalkaji, shall take steps for the eviction of the unauthorized occupants of the said

dharamshala, within ten days. Any *jhuggis* dwellers who are also in occupation shall also be got evicted by the SHO, P.S. Kalkaji, with cooperation from other concerned agencies and the Id. Administrator.

22. Insofar as rehabilitation of the *jhuggi* dwellers and unauthorised occupants etc., was concerned, the Court had been informed that there are several flats lying vacant under the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (*hereinafter*, “JNNURM”) Scheme. Vide order dated 15th March, 2022, this Court had issued directions in respect of the EWS flats under the JNNURM scheme, which are lying vacant. On the said date, this Court was informed that approximately 52,000 flats which are available under the JNNURM scheme have not yet been allotted due to the delay in execution of the agreement between the Central Government and the State Government with respect to such flats. Accordingly, this Court had directed a joint status report to be filed by the Secretary, Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Government of India along with the Chief Secretary, GNCTD as under:

“8. In so far as the larger issue of non-allotment of JNNURM flats to eligible persons is concerned, this Court is of the opinion that such a large number of flats ought not to be kept vacant and ought to be utilized for the purpose of economically weaker sections of society/urban poor' for whom these flats are made. Mr. Anurag Ahluwalia, Id. Standing Counsel for the Central Government, has also been present in the proceedings today and he submits that he would bring this fact to the notice of the Secretary, Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Government of India. In addition, this order would also be communicated to the Chief Secretary, GNCTD, through Mr. Gautam Narayan, Id. ASC for GNCTD, for necessary

information and action.

9. The Secretary, Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Government of India, along with Chief Secretary, GNCTD shall file a joint status report in respect of implementation of the JNNURM scheme in Delhi within four weeks, so that the same can be considered by the Court and the matter in respect of implementation of the scheme can be placed before the appropriate bench, if the need arises. It is expected that the governmental authorities would take expedited action in this regard so that these flats are not kept vacant.”

23. Mr. Anurag Ahluwalia, Id. CGSC, appears today and submits that the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Union of India has given its inputs to the GNCTD and has asked for further inputs, in order to enable the filing of the joint status report.

24. Mr. Adithya Nair, Id. Counsel appearing on behalf of Mr. Gautam Narayan, Id. ASC, GNCTD, submits that he does not have instructions as to the filing of the joint status report or inputs given by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Union of India.

25. It is, accordingly, directed that the concerned officials from the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Union of India and GNCTD shall hold a joint meeting, on or before 30th May, 2022, and place the joint status report in terms of order dated 15th March, 2022, before the Court on 1st June, 2022. If the said meeting is not held, both the parties shall place their respective status reports on record, and the concerned officials of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs, Union of India and GNCTD shall join the proceedings on 1st June, 2022, either physically or virtually.

CS (OS) 648/2021

26. Vide order dated 9th December, 2021 in this matter, this Court had recorded as under:

“CS (OS) 648/2021

64. *The present suit has been filed by Smt. Rajwati against the Defendant- Mr. Rajesh Kumar (Sl. No. 99) who is represented by Mr. Bhushan, Id. Counsel. The prayer in the suit is as under:*

“(i) a decree for Rs.1,65,983/- (Rs. One lac sixty five thousand nine hundred eighty three only) along with further interest at 18% per year from date of suit till payment be passed against the defendant and in favour of the plaintiff.”

65. *None appears for the Plaintiff.*

66. **Today, Mr. Rajesh Kumar has given his undertaking in FAO 36/2021 and connected matters, as recorded above, to the effect that he shall, along with his family, vacate the said premises of the shop on or before 25th December, 2021. The said undertaking has been given through Mr. Bhushan, Id. Counsel.**

67. *Let notice be issued to Mrs. Rajwati, as well as her Counsel, returnable on 22nd February, 2022. Notice be issued through all permissible modes.”*

27. Ld. Counsel appearing for the Plaintiff - Smt. Rajwati submits that a direction was issued against the Defendant in the present suit to vacate the suit premises in the year 2014. However, the said Defendant continued to be in occupation of the said shop, even as of December, 2021.

28. On the other hand, Mr. R.R. Singh, Id. Counsel for the Defendant submits that the Defendant had vacated the said shop in the year 2014.

29. **List this matter for hearing on 3rd August, 2022 at 2:30 P.M.**

CS(OS) 588/2021

30. Let copy of the application being *I.A. 6019/2022* be furnished to Mr. Thakur, ld. Counsel, by Mr. Kamal Mehta, ld. Counsel.

31. **List on 3rd August, 2022, for consideration of I.A. 6019/2022 at 2:30 P.M.**

RSA 109/2018 & CS(OS) 512/2021

32. It is submitted in these matters that *baari* of the concerned *baridaars* begins on 8th-9th July, 2022 and therefore the matters may be taken up at the earliest.

33. **Accordingly, list both these matters on 4th July, 2022 at 2:30 P.M. CS(OS) 518/2021, CS(OS) 520/2021, CS(OS) 521/2021, CS(OS) 546/2021 & CS(OS) 552/2021**

34. List all these matters on *19th September, 2022* at *2:30 P.M.*
CS(OS) 641/2005 & CS(OS) 642/2005

35. List all these matters on *28th July, 2022* at *2:30 P.M.*

**PRATHIBA M. SINGH
JUDGE**

MAY 20, 2022

Rahul/Aman/DK/AD/MS

भारतमेव जयते