



\$~24

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **RFA 933/2023 & CM APPL. 60686/2023**
SANJAY KUMAR Appellant

Through: None.

versus

PREM PRAKASH GUPTA Respondent
Through: Mr. Raj Kumar and Ms. Chanchal
Sharma, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA DHARI SINGH

% **ORDER**
25.04.2024

None appeared on behalf of the appellant.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent submitted that the suit premises have been vacated.

Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent and perused the contents of the instant appeal as well as the impugned decree and judgment dated 23rd August, 2023.

Upon perusal of the same, it is made out that the learned Court below adjudicating upon the application filed by the respondent/plaintiff under Order 12 Rule 6 CPC allowed the same on a categorical admission made on behalf of the appellant/defendant therein, that he was a tenant at the suit premises.

This Court *vide* Order dated 15th January, 2024, had directed the appellant to vacate the suit property within a period of two months i.e., on or



before 20th March, 2024, failing which the stay order in operation as per the Order dated 23rd November, 2023, passed by the Predecessor Bench of this Court, shall stand vacated.

In view of the submission made on behalf of the respondent i.e., the appellant has vacated the premises, nothing survives to be adjudicate upon in the instant appeal.

Accordingly, the instant appeal alongwith accompanying application stands disposed of.

CHANDRA DHARI SINGH, J

APRIL 25, 2024

rk/av

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