

\$~17

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

+ CM(M) 501/2012

VIJAY KUMAR DUGGAL

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Anil Kumar Mishra, Advcate

versus

SURENDER KUMAR JAIN

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Rahul Kadyam, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

%

19.01.2016

The tenancy of the petitioner stood terminated vide legal notice dated 01.10.2008 which clearly and categorically states that the tenancy of the petitioner stood terminated w.e.f. 21.04.2008. The Trial Court vide impugned order dated 30.03.2012 had noted the factual matrix in the correct perspective; it had noted that the tenancy of the petitioner stood terminated w.e.f. 21.04.2008 vide legal notice dated 01.10.2008. The petitioner was liable to pay mense profits in this intervening period @ 35,000/- per month in terms of the decree passed by the Additional District Judge.

Accordingly, after giving benefit of security amounts which had been paid by the petitioner a sum of Rs. 8,30,000/- had been calculated to be paid by the petitioner to the respondent. It has been informed to the Court that out of Rs. 8,30,000/-, Rs. 6,00,000/- has been paid to the respondent. Balance of Rs. 2,30,000/- be paid by the petitioner to the

respondent within two weeks from today failing which petitioner will be liable for contempt.

Petition disposed of.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

JANUARY 19, 2016

gb