

\$~60

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

+ RFA 19/2017

VINOD KUMAR VOHRA Appellant

Through Appellant in person.

versus

PARVEEN CHADHA Respondent

Through None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.S.TEJI

ORDER

% **05.07.2017**

C.M. 23185/2017 (Direction)

The present application has been filed for extension of time to vacate the property.

I have heard the appellant present in person.

The order dated 28.02.2017 was passed with the consent of the appellant wherein the respondent undertook to indemnify the appellant for any claims that may be raised against him by the sister of the respondent or any other party in the future. The settlement was arrived between the parties. It was further mentioned in the order that the appellant wanted to continue in the suit premises till 30.06.2017 to which the respondent did not have any objection apart from monetary settlement.

Para 4 of the order further shows that the appellant undertook that he will hand over the vacant possession of the suit premises on or

before 30.06.2017.

Admittedly, period allowed upto 30.06.2017 has already expired. Today another application has been moved for extension of time to vacate the premises. As per order dated 28.02.2017 was passed on the undertaking given and the settlement of the parties, no ground is made out for extension of time.

The application is accordingly dismissed.

P.S.TEJI, J

JULY 05, 2017
dd