



\$~31

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

+ **RC.REV. 45/2018 & CM APPL. 5011/2018**

SHAKUNTALA GUPTA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Praveen Suri, Mr. Akhil Kumar,
Mr. Jayesh Nayar, Advocates.

versus

SANJEEV BANSAL & ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ajay Gupta, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

ORDER

29.10.2024

%

1. Learned Counsel for the Respondents submits that the possession of the subject premises has been taken over through execution proceedings in February 2018.

1.1 Learned Counsel for the Petitioner does not dispute the said submission.

2. Learned Counsel for the Respondents, thus, submits that since the possession of the subject premises has been restored, nothing further survives in the present Petition and the Petition has become infructuous.

2.1 In this regard, reliance is placed upon the judgment passed by this Court captioned ***Ashok Gupta v. Deepak Rao***¹, which has relied upon the judgments of the Supreme Court in ***NC Daga v. Inder Mohan Singh Rana***²

¹ 2024 SCC OnLine Del 7148

² (2003) 1 SCC 453



and ***Vinod Kumar Verma v. Manmohan Verma***³. This Court is supported in its view by judgments passed by Coordinate Benches of this Court including ***Om Prakash Ashok Kumar & Sons v. Ajay Khurana***⁴, ***Neelam Sharma v. Ekant Rekhan***⁵, and ***Bhawani Shankar v Nand Lal and Ors***⁶.

3. In addition, it is contended that the Petitioner is adequately protected in terms of Section 19(1) of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958.

4. In view of the foregoing discussion, the Petition and all pending Application(s) stand disposed of.

TARA VITASTA GANJU, J

OCTOBER 29, 2024/ ha

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)

³ Civil Appeal Nos. 5220-5221 of 2008 order dated 19.08.2008

⁴ 2024 SCC OnLine Del 5228

⁵ 2019 SCC Online Del 6487

⁶ 2021 SCC OnLine Del 4284