

\$~9

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

RFA 57/2018

MUNTIYAZ

..... Appellant

Through: None.

versus

ASGARI BEGUM

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. M. Naushad, Advocate (Mobile No. 9810782767).

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VALMIKI J. MEHTA

ORDER

%

25.09.2018

C.M. Appl. Nos. 39103/2018 (for vacating the tenanted premises) and 39104/2018 (for exemption)

1. Counsel for the applicant/respondent has understood that ordinarily in RFAs when notices are issued and stay is granted of operation of the impugned judgment, the matter after being admitted comes up for Regular hearing not before ten years but ordinarily around ten to fifteen years.

2. By the order dated 19.1.2018 no notice was issued in the RFA, but the RFA was withdrawn and time was only granted to vacate the suit premises till 31.1.2020. The applicant/respondent challenged this order before the Supreme Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide

RFA 57/2018

page 1 of 2

order dated 10.8.2018 in SLP(C) No. 25833/2018 dismissed the SLP but granted an opportunity to the applicant/respondent to seek reduction of time.

3. After arguments counsel for the applicant/respondent says that he has understood that on the appeal having been directed to be withdrawn on the very first date and only granting time for vacating till 30.1.2020 instead of issuing notice in the appeal, the applicant/respondent in fact is not prejudiced but in fact the order dated 19.1.2018 is to the advantage of the applicant/respondent. Therefore, these applicants are at this stage disposed of as not pressed.

VALMIKI J. MEHTA, J

SEPTEMBER 25, 2018

AK