

\$~A-2

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CM(M) 952/2016 & REVIEW PET. 31/2018**

KAILASH RANI

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Rajiv Khosla and Ms.Apoorva
Khosla, Advs.

versus

MALLO MALL MALHOTRA & ORS

..... Respondents

Through Mr.Bhaskar Tiwari and Mr.Ramakant
Shukla, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT NATH

ORDER

% **19.01.2018**

REVIEW PET. 31/2018

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner firstly submits that on the death of Mr.Krishan Lal, the original tenant, his successors would be tenants in common and not joint tenants. Hence, service of notice on the petitioner was mandatory. He secondly submits that respondent No.3 Ms.Geeta Khatter for whose benefit the eviction petition was filed and who is the daughter of the landlord respondent No.1 had inherited a palatial bungalow in Pitam Pura. It is from that bungalow the brother-in-law and she have been carrying out business jointly. The brother-in-law is also staying in one floor of the premises. It is also pleaded that brother-in-law has let out his own house at Shalimar Bagh at a handsome rent. Hence, it is pleaded that there is an error apparent on the face of the record as this court has not dealt with these

submissions and hence the present review petition.

In my opinion, there is no error apparent on the face of the record. These pleas have been dealt with the impugned order. The present review petition is without merit and is dismissed.

JAYANT NATH, J

JANUARY 19, 2018

rk