



\$~55

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

+ **RC.REV. 24/2017 & CM APPL. 2292/2017**

ASHOK KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Puneet Yadav, Advocate

versus

SHANTI DEVI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Puneet Yadav and Mr. Sourabh Gupta, Mr. Vasu Dev and Dr. Suman Chaudhary, Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SUDHIR KUMAR JAIN

ORDER

%

12.09.2024

1. The present revision petition is filed under section 25B (8) of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958 (hereinafter referred to as the “**Act**”) to impugn the order dated 21.09.2016 passed by the court of Sh. Navjeet Budhirajaa, ACJ-cum-ARC-cum-CC, Dwarka Courts, Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the “**trial court**”) in eviction petition bearing E no. 08/2010 titled as **Shanti Devi V Ashok Kumar** whereby the application for leave to defend preferred by the petitioner was dismissed.

2. The respondent filed an eviction petition under section 14(1)(e) read with section 25B of the Act against the petitioner on the ground of *bona fide* requirement. The petitioner after service of summons as per the Third Schedule of the Act, filed an application for leave to defend, which was dismissed by the trial court vide impugned order dated 21.09.2016, as a consequence of which, an eviction order was passed in favour of the



respondent. The petitioner being aggrieved, filed the present petition.

3. Mr. Puneet Yadav, Advocate for the respondent stated that the possession of the tenanted premises has already been restored back to the respondent in execution of warrant of possession and as such, the present petition has become infructuous.

4. This Court in the judgment dated 26.07.2024 passed in RC.REV. 284/2023 titled as **Om Prakash Ashok Kumar & Sons V Shri Ajay Khurana** held as under:-

7. The issue which needs Judicial consideration is whether the revision petition which is filed as per section 25B (8) of the Act to impugn the order of eviction as per section 25B of the Delhi Rent Control Act and if during the pendency of the revision petition, the possession is restored back to the landlord/owner, whether, in that eventuality the revision petition is maintainable or not.

8. In N. C. Daga V Inder Mohan Singh Rana 2003 (1) SCC 453 the respondent/landlord filed the petition for eviction primarily on the ground of *bona fide* requirement which was opposed by the petitioners/tenant. The eviction order was passed as per section 14(1)(e) of the Act in favour of the respondent/landlord with the direction that the possession of the tenanted premises shall not be taken before the expiry of 06 months in terms of section 14(7) of the Act. The revision petition before the High Court of Delhi was also dismissed by holding that no prima facie case was made out by the tenant. The Supreme Court dealt with the arguments raised on behalf of the landlord that the petition has become infructuous because the possession has already been taken in pursuant to the execution of the order passed by the rent controller. The Supreme Court has observed that in view of the admitted position that pursuant to the order passed by the rent controller, the possession has already been taken on execution of order permitting eviction did not examine the rival stand of the parties and accordingly dismissed the petition.

9. The Supreme Court in Vinod Kumar Verma V Manmohan Verma & Anr. in Civil Appeal No.5220-5221 of 2008 arising out of



SLP (C) nos. 11268-11264/2008 vide order dated 19.08.2008 has also disposed of the appeals as infructuous as the possession of the tenanted premises was taken over by the landlord.

10. This Court in various decisions has followed the decision given by the Supreme Court in N. C. Daga V Inder Mohan Singh Rana. The Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in Poonam Bangia V Harbhagwan Dass Chandiramani in RC. REV. no.16/2021 vide order dated 22.07.2021 after following the law laid down in N. C. Daga V Inder Mohan Singh Rana, dismissed the revision petition after observing that the landlord has received the possession of the tenanted premises through execution proceedings. Another Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in Mange Ram V Rajesh Narain Goel, in RC. REV. no. 147/2021, decided on 19.03.2024 after following N. C. Daga V Inder Mohan Singh Rana and Vinod Kumar Verma V Manmohan Verma & Anr., in Civil Appeal nos. 5220-5221/2008 passed by the Supreme Court and in Poonam Bangia V Harbhagwan Dass Chandiramani in RC. REV no. 16/2021 passed by this Court as mentioned hereinabove also dismissed the revision petition as became infructuous due to the reason that the possession of the subject premises has been restored to the respondent/landlord. The same view was also taken by another Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in Ram Avtar V Anuradha Shukla in RC. Rev. Bearing no. 104/2021 vide order dated 03.11.2023, the revision petition was ordered to be dismissed as the possession of the tenanted premises has already been taken by the respondent/landlord in accordance with law.

12. In the present case as reflected from the order dated 10.05.2024, the possession of the tenanted premises has already been restored back to the respondent/landlord in execution of warrant of possession in accordance with law. This Court is also of the view that the present petition is not maintainable. Accordingly, the present petition, along with pending applications stands dismissed being infructuous.

5. Accordingly, in view of the above observations made in the judgment dated 26.07.2024 passed in RC.REV. 284/2023 and as the possession of the tenanted premises has already been restored back to the respondent in



execution of warrant of possession in accordance with law, as such, the present revision petition has become infructuous. Hence, the present petition along with pending application, stands dismissed being infructuous.

DR. SUDHIR KUMAR JAIN, J

SEPTEMBER 12, 2024

N/TK