



\$~68

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

Date of Decision: 23.10.2024

+ **RC.REV. 207/2024 & CM APPL. 43973/2024 and CM APPL. 43974/2024**

SACHIN ASTHANA

.....Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

ADNAN AZAM

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Zeeshan Ahmed, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

TARA VITASTA GANJU, J.: (Oral)

1. None appears for the Petitioner today.
2. There was no appearance on the last date, i.e., 08.10.2024 as well.
3. This Court had on 08.10.2024 recorded as follows:
“3. This Court on 02.08.2024 had directed the learned Counsel for the Petitioner to take instructions from the Petitioner regarding the time which may be required by the Petitioner to vacate the subject premises. Thereafter, only adjournments were sought by the Petitioner for the said instructions.
4. Learned Counsel for the Respondent submits that the possession of the subject premises has been taken by the Respondent through execution proceedings on 05.10.2024.”
4. This Court has in ***RC.REV.419/2018*** captioned ***Ashok Gupta & Anr. v. Deepak Rao*** dated 04.10.2024, has already taken the following view:

“18. The Eviction Petition was filed by the Respondent/landlord under Section 14(1)(e) of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958 setting out the requirement to open his law offices. The proceeding was contested by the Petitioner/tenant and an Eviction Order was passed by the



learned Trial Court. Pursuant thereto, the Respondent/landlord recovered possession of the demised premises in accordance with law. As such the Revision Petition has been filed challenging the order of the learned Trial Court which has now gained fruition and was executed and has already been implemented through execution proceedings. In these circumstances, the Revision Petition has become infructuous.

*19. As stated above, the jurisdiction of this Court exercising revisionary powers is limited and circumspect. The Petitioner/tenant did not initiate civil proceedings for recovery of possession, instead the present Revision Petition was filed. The Petitioner/tenant has not contended that Section 19 of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958 has been violated. Relying on the judgment of the Supreme Court in the **NC Daga** case and **Vinod Kumar Verma** case, this Court finds that this Petition has become infructuous and is accordingly dismissed."*

5. In view of the foregoing, the Petition and all pending Applications stand dismissed.

TARA VITASTA GANJU, J

OCTOBER 23, 2024/SA

Click here to check corrigendum, if any