



\$~37

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **C.R.P. 285/2024, CM APPL. 57764/2024**
INDU YADAV

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Shweta Priya, Advocate.

versus

SUBHASH YADAV

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Kr. Yadav, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

01.10.2024

%

1. A Revision Petition under Section 115 CPC has been filed on behalf for the petitioner to challenge the Order dated 06.07.2024 vide which though Leave to Defend has been filed by the Revisionist/defendant has been allowed, but a direction has been given to deposit Rs.8 lakhs being 50% of Rs.16 lakhs of which the suit has been filed, in an FDR in the name of the Court within one month.
2. The Revisionist submits that there is no liability of paying any amount since the amount of Rs.14 lakhs had been received by the defendant in lieu of rent of one floor which the defendant has given on rent to the plaintiff. It is a matter of trial, moreover, the learned ADJ in the impugned Order had observed that the defence which has been taken by the defendant/Revisionist is highly improbable as the receipt of Rs.14 lakhs is admitted and only a sum of Rs.2 lakhs has been denied. In the interest of justice an opportunity had



been given to the defendant to prove his defence.

3. There is no merit in the present Revision Petition, however, considering the submissions made defendant/Revisionist is given three months' time within which to deposit Rs.8 lakhs as directed by the impugned Order.

4. No further directions are required.

5. The petition along with the pending application stands disposed of.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

OCTOBER 1, 2024/va