

\$~8

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

+ CM(M) 587/2015 & C.M. No.11158/2015

ARUN JAIN & ORS Petitioners
Through: Mr. Deepak Dewan, Advocate.

versus

REKHA GOEL Respondent
Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT NATH

ORDER
% **22.08.2016**

1. None is present on behalf of the respondent despite service of notice.
2. By the present petition, the petitioner has impugned the order dated 26.2.2015 passed by the appellate court. Before the appellant court, the order of the trial court dated 3.1.2015 was impugned. By the said order dated 3.1.2015, the trial court had passed a direction on an application filed under Order 39 Rule 10 CPC that defendant Nos.3 to 5/tenants/petitioners to make payment of rent as per admitted rate to the plaintiff/respondent with effect from 5.4.2014. Defendant No.1 was restrained from collecting the rent from the tenants.
3. By the impugned order, the appellate court dismissed the appeal

holding it to be barred by limitation.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, however, submits that there is a confusion inasmuch as the tenants/petitioners are not aware as to whom the rent is to be paid. It is averred that there are disputes between the owners.

5. This is not the subject-matter of the present petition. The petitioner may raise these issues before the appropriate forum. No ground is urged to interfere with the order of the appellate court. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

JAYANT NATH, J.

AUGUST 22, 2016
‘AA’