

\$~28

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

% Judgment delivered on: 27.09.2019

+ RC.REV. 264/2018

SANTOSH PANDEY

..... Petitioner

versus

VIRENDER KUMAR

..... Respondent

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner: Ms. Swathi Sukumar with Mr. Naveen
Nagarjuna, Advocates.

For the Respondent: Mr. Gibran Naushad, Advocate.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

**RC.REV. 264/2018 & CM APPL.23711/2018 (stay), CM
APPL.23712/2018 (for additional documents), CM
APPL.36075/2018 (for directions)**

1. Petitioner impugns order dated 11.07.2017, whereby, leave to defend application of the petitioner has been dismissed and an eviction order passed. Petitioner also impugns order dated 02.04.2018, whereby review petition, filed by the petitioner, seeking review of order dated 11.07.2017, was dismissed.

2. Subject eviction petition was filed by the respondent seeking

eviction of the petitioner on the ground of bonafide necessity under section 14(1)(e) of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958 from a shop forming part of property No.70, Anand Nagar, Inderlok, Delhi, more particularly, as shown in red colour in the site plan annexed to the eviction petition.

3. Parties were referred to mediation. Parties have settled their disputes and consequent to settlement, petitioner has already handed over physical vacant possession of the tenanted premises to the respondent.

4. Learned counsel for the parties submits that all claims *inter se* have been settled and nothing is due against each other.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the petition.

6. Petition is, accordingly, dismissed as withdrawn.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

SEPTEMBER 27, 2019
st