

11

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ RC.REV. 219/2010

MANISH KUMAR NANDA Petitioner
Through : Mr. Sanjiv Bahl, Adv.

versus

RADHEY SHAM GUPTA Respondent
Through: Mr. Sunil Sabharawal, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE VEENA BIRBAL

%

ORDER
12.11.2010

Today, petitioner has paid a sum of Rs. 2584/- to the respondent in court. Counsel for both the parties submits that rent upto November, 2010 stands paid.

On the last date hearing, counsel for petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is not pressing the petition on merits and had requested for two years' time to vacate the premises i.e. upto 31.10.2012. Counsel for respondent had given no objection to that. Accordingly, petitioner was directed to file usual undertaking in terms of settlement on the last date of hearing. Petitioner has filed an undertaking. Copy has already been given to the respondent/tenant.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By: AMULYA
Certify that the digital file and
physical file have been compared and
the digital data is as per the physical
file and no page is missing.

4

Counsel for respondent has pointed out in para 2 of the undertaking petitioner should mention that he is in exclusive possession of the tenanted premises. Counsel for petitioner/tenant has no objection in this regard. With the permission of the court, petitioner has added in para 2 that "he is in exclusive possession of the tenanted premises". He has added the same in a copy provided to the opposite party also. The undertaking given by the petitioner is accepted and petitioner is given time to vacate the premises in question by 30.10.2012.

In view of the above, respondent shall not execute the eviction order till 31.10.2012. The petition stands disposed of accordingly.



VEENA BIRBAL,J

NOVEMBER 12, 2010
rs