



\$~18 & 19

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

CNR No. DLHC010094682023

+ RFA 225/2023

RAKESH KUMAR Appellant

Through: Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate

versus

SH AJAY KUMAR & ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr. U.M. Tripathi, Advocate for R-1

19

CNR No. DLHC010094902023

+ RFA 226/2023, CM APPL. 13344/2023, CM APPL. 13346/2023, CM APPL. 53258/2026

RAKESH KUMAR & ANR. Appellants

Through: Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate

versus

SH. AJAY KUMAR Respondent

Through: Mr. U.M. Tripathi, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

%

24.08.2026

1. Learned Counsel for the Appellants states that on instruction, he is making a statement that the Appellants do not intend to contest the Appeal. However, time of six months is sought for vacating the premises.
2. Learned Counsel for the Respondents has opposed the grant of time to vacate the property on the ground that there are no occupation charges



awarded to the Respondent. Despite the judgment being given in 2022, the Appellants are continuing to be in possession of the suit property.

Submissions heard.

3. Considering the circumstances as pointed out by the learned Counsel for the Appellants, the Appeal is dismissed and four weeks' time is given to the Appellants to vacate the property. In case they fail to vacate the premises within four weeks, they shall be liable to pay Rs.10,000/- p.m. till the time they vacate the property. In case the property is not vacated even thereafter, it shall be liable for enhancement by 10% every year.
4. Undertaking be filed by both the parties within one week before the learned Registrar.
5. The Appeal along with pending Applications, is accordingly disposed of.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J.

AUGUST 24, 2026

N