

\$~32

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

+ **RC.REV. 137/2017**

SHYAM LAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.S.C.Jha, Advocate

versus

RENU BAJAJ

.....Respondent

Through: Mr.Arvind Kumar, Advocate with
respondent in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

%

05.05.2017

RC.REV. 137/2017

1. On 27th March, 2017 when the matter came up for hearing, it was submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner wants to settle the matter if some reasonable time is given to him to vacate the tenanted premises. This Court noted the above submission and passed the following order:-

“After some arguments learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner would like to settle the matter if some reasonable time is granted to vacate the tenanted premises.

Limited to the said submission of the petitioner, issue notice to the respondent through ordinary process and speed post, returnable for 05.05.2017.

Dasti notice be also served on the counsel appearing for the respondent before the Trial Court.

Till the next date of hearing there shall be stay of the execution of the eviction order.”

2. Respondent has been served and today she has appeared along with her counsel.

3. Petitioner is present along with his counsel. He submits that he needs at least five years time to vacate the suit property. This proposal is not acceptable to the respondent. However, learned counsel for the respondent agrees to give reasonable time upto one year to the petitioner to hand over the peaceful and vacant possession of the suit property to which learned counsel for the petitioner has agreed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks time to furnish an undertaking to this effect and the matter is passed over.

2nd Call (1.00 p.m.)

5. When the matter is taken up again learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has left the Court after informing him that he does not want to furnish any such undertaking.

6. Considering the fact that limited notice was issued in this case and the petitioner is neither willing to vacate the suit property within a reasonable period of one year to which the respondent has agreed nor preferred to appear after the passover when the matter was listed for furnishing an undertaking by the petitioner to vacate the suit property within one year, the oral request made the petitioner to grant at least five years time to vacate the tenanted premises is declined.

7. The revision petition stands dismissed.

CM No.11883/2017

Dismissed as infructuous.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

MAY 05, 2017

'pg'