



\$~59

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

+ **CMI 17/2024**

ANJANA SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vivek K. Tandon, Mr. Harshit S
Gahlot and Ms. Perna Tandon,
Advocates alongwith
Petitioner-in-person

versus

JINU PRAKASH

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Vikas Chadha, Advocate
alongwith respondent-in-person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

% **29.04.2025**

CM APPL. 25205/2025 (for extension of two months for compliance of order dated 07.08.2024)

1. By virtue of the abovesaid application, the appellant/applicant is seeking extension of two months for compliance of order dated 07.08.2024. It is, vaguely, mentioned in the application that she is making all efforts for locating another House/Flat and seeks another period of, at least, two months to vacate the house in question.
2. When the present Appeal was taken up by the Coordinate Bench of this court on 07.08.2024, both the sides were present before the Court and since, they had reached a settlement, the Appeal was disposed of with certain directions.
3. The appellant was directed to handover the physical possession of the property in question on or before 15.04.2025. Thus, period of around eight

CMI 17/2024

1



months was given to her to vacate the house in question and, simultaneously, she also undertook to pay monthly rent @ Rs. 7000/- per month from September, 2024 onwards.

4. When asked, it was apprised that even such arrears have not been cleared in full.

5. According to learned counsel for respondent, there are unpaid arrear for seven months. Appellant/Applicant also does not dispute the same.

6. The Appeal was disposed of after recording the clear-cut undertaking given by the parties.

7. The averment made in the application under disposal are completely vague and unspecific. Moreover, if at all, the appellant had any bonafide intention, she should have rather moved the application, before the expiry of the deadline given to her. It is quite obvious that she has filed the present application as the respondent/Decree-holder has already filed an Execution Petition and the matter is now fixed for appointment of Bailiff.

8. Be that as it may, fact remains that no reason, much less a compelling one, has been demonstrated which may persuade this court to extend the time.

9. Resultantly, the application is dismissed.

MANOJ JAIN, J

APRIL 29, 2025/PU/JS



This is a digitally signed order.

The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.

The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 01/07/2025 at 00:40:04