$~4,5,8-11

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

\+ LPA 676/2012 & CM.No. 17567/2012

STYLE CRAFTS ..... Appellant

versus

PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK & ORS ..... Respondents

\+ LPA 677/2012 & CM.No. 17569/2012

KHATAU MAKANJI SPINNING & WEAVING CO LTD ..... Appellant

versus

PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK & ORS ..... Respondent

\+ LPA 682/2012 & CM.No. 17588/2012

FAIR DEALS ..... Appellant

versus

PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK & ORS ..... Respondents

\+ LPA 683/2012 & CM.No. 17590/2012

KHATAUR MAKANJI SPINNING & WEAVING CO LTD ..... Appellant

versus

PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK & ORS ..... Respondents



Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:AMULYA

+ LPA 684/2012 & CM.No. 17592/2012

STYLE CRAFTS ..... Appellant

versus

PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK & ORS ..... Respondents

+ LPA 685/2012 & CM.No. 17594/2012

USHA NANDA ..... Appellant

versus

PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK & ORS ..... Respondents

Present: Mr. S.K. Chaudhary, Adv. for the Appellants.
Mr. Y.P. Chandana, Adv. for Punjab National Bank.
Mr. Amrit Pal Singh, CGSC for Respondent No.3.

**CORAM:**
**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE**
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW**

**ORDER**

% **11.10.2012**

These intra court appeals impugn the common order dated 30th July, 2012 of the learned Single Judge dismissing WP(C) Nos. 2691/2010, 2922/2010, 2925/2010, 3025/2010, 3026/2010, 3028/2010, 3029/2010, 3031/2010, 3032/2010 respectively preferred by the appellants. The said writ petitions were preferred impugning the common order dated 26th March, 2010 of the

District Judge exercising powers as an appellate authority under the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorized Occupants) Act, 1971 dismissing the appeals preferred by the appellants against the orders of the Estate Officer of their eviction from the premises in their respective occupation in the Punjab National Bank Building, Arya Samaj Road, Karol Bagh, New Delhi belonging to the respondent Bank.

2. After some hearing, the counsel for the appellants under instructions from the partners/proprietors of each of the appellants stated to be present in Court states that the appellants do not want to press the present appeals and do not want to pursue any further the challenge to the orders of their respective eviction and only seek six months time from today to vacate the premises in their respective possession.

3. The counsel for the respondent Bank who appears on advance notice has been heard on the aforesaid aspect.

4. Considering the fact that the appellants have been in possession of their respective premises for long and are giving up the challenge to the orders of their eviction and further considering the short time of six months sought by them and also their willingness to furnish undertaking to this Court in this respect, it is deemed expedient to grant the said time of six

months to the appellants.

5. The proprietors/partners of each of the appellants present in Court through their Advocate undertake to this Court as under:

a. That they are in possession and control of their respective premises and are as such in a position to give the undertaking to this Court;

b. To deliver vacant peaceful physical possession of the premises in their respective possession to the respondent Bank on or before the expiry of six months from today;

c. To not seek extension of the said time for any reason whatsoever;

d. To not induct any other person into use or occupation or possession of the premises;

e. To not pursue the challenge to the orders of their respective eviction any further.

6. The counsel for the appellants has further confirmed that the partners/proprietors of the appellants present in Court are authorised to give the aforesaid undertaking. He has further assured that he will on or before 15th October, 2012 file affidavits, with advance copy to the counsel for the respondent, of the partners/proprietors of the appellants in this Court, also

containing the undertaking already given as aforesaid.

7. The undertaking aforesaid of each of the appellants are accepted and they are ordered to be bound by the same. The appellants have been informed the consequences of breach of undertaking given to this Court.

8. The appeals are accordingly dismissed as withdrawn, however giving six months time from today to the appellants to vacate the premises in their respective occupation and by binding the appellants to the undertaking aforesaid.

No costs.

**CHIEF JUSTICE**

**RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J**

**OCTOBER 11, 2012**
**M**