

\$~15

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

+ **TR.P.(C.) 39/2017**

RAMA GUPTA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pankaj Kumar, Adv.

Versus

SHEELA GUPTA & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. R.K. Sharma, Adv. for R-1.

Mr. A. Kumar, Adv. for R-2 to 6.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

%

01.11.2017

1. Transfer, invoking Section 24 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC), is sought of E No.81/2010 titled “Y.K. Sharma & Ors. Vs. Sheela Gupta & Anr.” and E. No.82/2010 titled “Y.K. Sharma & Ors. Vs. Sheela Gupta & Anr.” both of the Court of Sh. Saurabh Kaushik, Additional Rent Controller (ARC), District Shahdara, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi to the Court of Sh. J.P. Nahar, Civil Judge-cum-ARC, District East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.
2. Notice of the petition was ordered to be issued and the counsel for the respondent no.1 and the counsel for the respondents no.2 to 6 appear.
3. The counsel for the petitioner states that the property with respect to which the aforesaid two petitions for eviction under the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958 have been filed is situated in District East; it is thus appropriate that the Eviction Petitions aforesaid are transferred from District Shahdara to District East, though Courts of both the said districts are situated in Karkardooma

Courts, Delhi. It is further stated that now Sh. Saurabh Kaushik, ARC, District Shahdara, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi has been replaced by Ms. Geetanjali, ARC. It is yet further contended that a civil suit pertaining to the same property is also pending before the Civil Judge, District East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi and if the Eviction Petitions are transferred to the District East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi as sought, the Eviction Petitions as well as the civil suit can be decided by the Court of the Civil Judge-cum-ARC East, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

4. The counsel for the respondent no.1 has no objection.

5. The counsel for the respondents no.2 to 6 states that the petitions for eviction have been pending for the last over seven years and the transfer would further delay the disposal of the Eviction Petitions. It is further stated that the petitions for eviction have been filed by the respondents no.2 to 6 for eviction of the respondent no.1; the petitioner herein has sought impleadment therein claiming adversely qua the property to the respondents no.2 to 6 and that the petitioner herein is the daughter of the respondent no.1 in the petitions for eviction.

6. In view of the aforesaid, no ground for transfer is made out.

Dismissed.

No costs.

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J

NOVEMBER 01, 2017

‘gsr’..