

\$~24

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

+ RC.REV. 190/2015

RADHEY SHYAM

..... Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

SANTOSH KUMAR GOEL & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr.M.L.Mahajan and Mr.Gaurav
Mahajan, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

%

24.04.2017

RC.REV. 190/2015

1. The petitioner/tenant has filed the instant revision petition challenging the order dated 27th January, 2015 passed by the learned ARC in Eviction Petition No.1052/2014 whereby the application for grant of leave to defend moved by the petitioner herein was dismissed and consequently, the eviction petition filed by the respondent No.1/landlord under Section 14(1)(e) read with Section 25-B of Delhi Rent Control Act was allowed.

2. Perusal of the record reveals that vide proceedings dated 3rd July, 2015 names of respondents No.2 and 3 – the other tenants of the respondents No.1/landlord (who were respondents No.2 and 3 before the learned ARC and contested the eviction petition) were ordered to be deleted from the array of parties in view of the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner to the effect that they have entered into a settlement with the

RC.REV. 190/2015

Page 1 of 2

respondent No.1/landlord and also handed over the possession of the suit property.

3. Further during the pendency of the revision petition, the respondent No.1 Santosh Kumar Goel has expired and his legal heirs, namely Smt.Usha Devi, Sh.Deepak Kumar, Sh.Nitin Kumar, Ms.Anuradha and Ms.Madhvi were substituted as respondents No.R1(i) to (v), who are contesting this revision petition.

4. Today learned counsel for respondent No.1 (i) to (v) has placed on record the copy of the notice issued by MCD declaring the suit property as dangerous building as well as the photographs showing that the suit property has already been demolished by the MCD. Learned counsel for the respondent No.1(i) to (v) submits that in the given circumstances, the revision petition has become infructuous.

5. The petitioner is present in person and does not dispute the above factum of demolition of suit property by the MCD.

6. In view of the submissions made above, the revision petition is dismissed for having become infructuous.

CM No.7466/2015

Dismissed as infructuous.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

APRIL 24, 2017

'st'