

\$~12

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

+ CM(M) 304/2016

SITARA & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. I.J. Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. H.P. Srivastava, Adv.

versus

SURENDER KUMAR & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ankit Jain, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.K.GAUBA

ORDER

%

03.05.2018

The petition at hand was filed in March, 2016 challenging the order dated 12.02.2016 of the additional rent controller (ARC) on the file of case (E. No.45/14/12) whereby leave to contest was granted to the respondents on their application under Section 25-B of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958, the proceedings taken up by the petitioners being for an order of eviction on the ground of *bona fide* need of the tenanted premises under Section 14 (1)(e) of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958.

The respondents had appeared through counsel on the first available opportunity, after notice was served on 26.08.2016. On request in which the petitioners had joined, the matter was adjourned for 05.12.2016. On 05.12.2016, there was another request by the counsel for the petitioner for adjournment and, thus, it was directed to be listed on 16.03.2017. The court clarified at that stage that the main matter before the ARC would continue to be heard in the meantime. The matter has not been heard thereafter on three

consecutive dates. Today again the counsel for the petitioners is not available, he having sent proxy only to seek adjournment.

Meanwhile, the court is informed, the proceedings before the ARC have made progress, the petitioners having already examined four witnesses.

In these circumstances, no useful purpose would be served, particularly when the petitioners themselves seem to be dis-interested, in keeping the revision petition pending. It is disposed of with these directions.

R.K.GAUBA, J.

MAY 03, 2018

vk