



\$~10

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

+ C.R.P. 314/2024 & CM APPL. 63266/2024

OM PRAKSH MALHOTRA & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Tushar Anand, Mr. Aseem
Nayyar, Advocates.

versus

SACHIN MALHOTRARespondent

Through: Ms. Nishita Gupta, Advocate.
Mr. Purvesh Buttan and Ms. Nishita
Gupta, Advocates for applicant in CM
APPL. 63266/2024.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

%

28.01.2026

1. An adjournment request is made on behalf of counsel for respondent, which is objected to by counsel for petitioner on the ground that even on the previous two dates, an adjournment request was made.
2. Proxy counsel for respondent states that counsel for respondent had to travel outside Delhi for another matter in another State.
3. Upon inquiry, it transpires that counsel for petitioner was not informed about this in the morning.
4. This manner of not informing the counsel of opposite side is strongly deprecated by the Court, since it causes inconvenience to other side's counsel, for no reason whatsoever.
5. Accordingly, cost of Rs.15,000/- shall be paid by counsel for respondent to counsel for petitioners within a period of two weeks.



6. Re-notify on 15th April 2026.
7. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

JANUARY 28, 2026/ak/tk