

\$~45

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **RC.REV. 484/2015**
GOPAL KRISHAN

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Dharam Raj Ohlan, Adv.

versus

M/S SHREYANS BUILDWELL PVT LTD

..... Respondent

Through Nemo.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER

%

09.03.2016

Review Pet. No.123/2016, C.M.No.8750/2016, C.M. No.8751/2016 & C.M. No.8752/2016

This is a petition seeks a review of the order dated 12.02.2016. Submission in the grounds taken for review are that the reference to the judgment relied upon in the impugned order i.e R.C. Rev. No.391/2013 had not been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner on that date and he was not in a position to examine it; moreover, the rejoinder filed by the petitioner to the reply to the application seeking leave to defend has not been examined as it does not find mention in the impugned order. Grounds for review are accordingly made out.

This Court is not in agreement with the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. Reference to R.C. Rev. No.391/2013 had only noted the need of the landlord in that petition which need as per the order passed in that petition (delivered on 10.03.2015) had been established.

The second submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that there was no mention of the rejoinder in the order for which review has been sought is also a submission without any force. While penning the order, the Court is not to detail the pleadings as pleaded in the Court; it is the conclusion drawn from the pleadings which forms the encompass of the order.

Review petition is wholly malafide. It is dismissed with costs quantified at Rs.10,000/-.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

MARCH 09, 2016

A