

\$~18

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **RC.REV. 488/2016 & CM 37754/2016**

PARKASH CHAND ARORA Petitioner
Through: Mr. Yogesh Saxena with
Mr. Chandan Mishra, Advocates.

versus

JATINDER MITTAL Respondent
Through: Mr. Parmod Kumar Singhal with
Mr. Rahul Singhal, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.K.GAUBA

ORDER
% **05.02.2018**

The prime contention raised by the petitioner is that the leave to defend application was entertained by the Additional Rent Controller belatedly. The counsel for the respondent, on the other hand, points out that the objection to such effect under the cover of maintainability of the leave to defend application was considered by the Additional Rent Controller but rejected by earlier order dated 01.05.2015. The counsel places on record photocopy of the said order. Confronted with this copy of the said earlier order, the counsel for the petitioner submits he has nothing to say. He concedes that the earlier order was not challenged.

At this stage, the counsel for the petitioner submits he may be allowed to withdraw the present petition.

The petition stands dismissed as withdrawn. The application filed therewith is rendered infructuous and is disposed of accordingly.

R.K.GAUBA, J

FEBRUARY 05, 2018//srb