



2024:DHC:8444



\$~42

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% ***Date of Decision: 29.10.2024***+ **RC.REV. 301/2018 & CM APPL. 26757/2018****CHAJJU RAM & ANR**Petitioners

Through: Mr. Anis Ahmed, Advocate.

versus

SUNIL YADAV & ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Ajay Gupta, Advocate.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU****TARA VITASTA GANJU, J.: (Oral)**

1. Learned Counsel for the Respondents/landlord draws the attention of the Court to various orders passed from time to time, including on 29.04.2024 wherein it is submitted that the possession of two rooms at Ground floor in property No.2059, Gali Akhare Wali, Bazar Sita Ram, Delhi-110006 which has been more specifically shown and delineated in red colour in the site plan attached [hereinafter referred to as "subject premises"] has been taken over through execution proceedings.
2. Learned Counsel for the Respondent/landlord further submits that in view of the foregoing, the present Petition has become infructuous.
3. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner/tenant affirms that the possession of subject premises has been taken over.



2024:DHC:8444



4. The issue of whether a Revision Petition is maintainable when the tenanted subject premises has been legally restored to the Respondents/landlord, either during or before the filing of the Revision Petition, has been addressed by the Supreme Court as well as by Coordinate Benches of this Court.

5. The Supreme Court in *NC Daga v. Inder Mohan Singh Rana*¹, dealt with a similar situation while dismissing a challenge by a tenant to a judgment passed by this Court upholding an order declining leave to defend passed by the learned Trial Court. The facts in the case were that, possession of the tenanted premises had been taken pursuant to an order passed by the Executing Court. The Supreme Court dealt with the similar arguments raised on behalf of the Respondent/landlord that the Petition has become infructuous pursuant to the possession having been taken.

6. After briefly examining the contention of the parties, the Supreme Court in *N.C Daga* case held that in view of the admitted position of possession being taken in execution proceedings, it was not necessary to go into the further details since such a decision would be a purely an academic question. The Supreme Court held as:

“6. In view of the admitted position that pursuant to the order passed by the Rent Controller, possession has been taken on execution of the order permitting eviction, and absence of specific stand regarding implied consent it is, however, not necessary to go into the finer details and to examine the rival stand in the background of legal position as it would amount to rendering decision on a purely academic question. The appeal is, therefore, dismissed, without any order as to costs.”

¹ (2003) 1 SCC 453



2024:DHC:8444



[Emphasis supplied]

7. A similar view was taken by the Supreme Court in ***Vinod Kumar Verma v. Manmohan Verma***² where on an averment by the Respondent/landlord that possession of the premises has already been taken over, the Supreme Court held that nothing further survives in the Appeal and disposed the Appeals as being infructuous. The order being brief is extracted below:

“Leave granted.

*At the time of hearing of these appeals, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the landlord-respondent submits, on instructions, that the possession of the premises in question has already been taken over by the landlord-respondent. That being the position, these appeals have now become infructuous, which have been filed against the final judgment and order dt.25.02.2008 and 28.03.2008 passed by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi in RCR No.49 of 2007 and C.M.No.119 of 2008 (Review) in RCR No.49 of 2007, by which the Revision Petition filed by the tenant/appellant was dismissed and order of eviction was affirmed. **Since the possession has already been taken over by the landlord-respondent, in our view nothing survives in these appeals and accordingly, the appeals are disposed of as infructuous.***

Interim order, if any, stands vacated.

There will be no order as to costs.”

[Emphasis Supplied]

8. Various Coordinate Benches of this Court have also similarly held that the tenant’s Petition have become infructuous in view of possession being taken. Reliance is placed on ***Neelam Sharma v. Ekant Rekhan***³ and ***Bhawani Shankar v Nand Lal and Ors.***⁴.

² Civil Appeal Nos. 5220-5221 of 2008 order dated 19.08.2008

³ 2019 SCC Online Del 6487

⁴ 2021 SCC OnLine Del 4284



8.1 In *Om Prakash Ashok Kumar & Sons v. Ajay Khurana*⁵ while relying on the *NC Daga* case and several other cases, a Coordinate Bench held as follows:

“10. This Court in various decisions has followed the decision given by the Supreme Court in *N.C. Daga v. Inder Mohan Singh Rana*. The Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in *Poonam Bangia v. Harbhagwan Dass Chandiramani* in RC. REV. no. 16/2021 vide order dated 22.07.2021 after following the law laid down in *N.C. Daga v. Inder Mohan Singh Rana*, dismissed the revision petition after observing that the landlord has received the possession of the tenanted premises through execution proceedings. Another Coordinate Bench of this Court in *Mange Ram v. Rajesh Narain Goel*, in RC. REV. no. 147/2021, decided on 19.03.2024 after following *N.C. Daga v. Inder Mohan Singh Rana and Vinod Kumar Verma v. Manmohan Verma*, in Civil Appeal nos. 5220 -5221/2008 passed by the Supreme Court and in *Poonam Bangia v. Harbhagwan Dass Chandiramani* in RC. REV no. 16/2021 passed by this Court as mentioned hereinabove also dismissed the revision petition as became infructuous due to the reason that the possession of the subject premises has been restored to the respondent/landlord. The same view was also taken by another Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in *Ram Avtar v. Anuradha Shukla* in RC. Rev. Bearing no. 104/2021 vide order dated 03.11.2023, the revision petition was ordered to be dismissed as the possession of the tenanted premises has already been taken by the respondent/landlord in accordance with law.

xxx

12. In the present case as reflected from the order dated 10.05.2024, the possession of the tenanted premises has already been restored back to the respondent/landlord in execution of warrant of possession in accordance with law. This Court is also of the view that the present petition is not maintainable. Accordingly, the present petition, along with pending applications stands dismissed being infructuous.”

[Emphasis Supplied]

9. This Court has in *RC.REV.419/2018* captioned *Ashok Gupta & Anr.*

⁵ 2024 SCC OnLine Del 5228



v. Deepak Rao⁶ has taken the following view:

“18. The Eviction Petition was filed by the Respondent/landlord under Section 141(c) [sic. 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.”

9.1 In addition, in **RC. REV. No. 104/2021** captioned as **Ram Avtar v. Anuradha Shukla** vide order dated 03.11.2023 this Court has held that once possession was taken over by the Respondent/landlord in accordance with law, the Petition becomes infructuous. The relevant extract of the **Ram Avtar** case reads as follows:

“4.1 This Court has considered this contention of the learned Counsel for the Petitioner/tenant. The Revision Petition has been filed challenging the order of the Trial Court which has now gained fruition, and has already been implemented through execution proceedings. In these circumstances, the Revision Petition has become infructuous.

5. Furthermore, this Court in various judgments held that once possession has been taken over by the Respondent/landlord in accordance with law, this petition becomes infructuous and in view thereof, nothing survives in the petition.”

[Emphasis supplied]

⁶ 2024 SCC OnLine Del 7148



2024:DHC:8444



10. The present Petition has been filed impugning the order and judgment of the learned Trial Court which has directed vacation of the subject premises in issue. The jurisdiction of this Court is only revisionary in nature and limited in scope. The Supreme Court in *Abid-Ul-Islam v. Inder Sain Dua*⁷ while interpreting the intendment of the legislature in removing two stages of Appeal that were earlier provided in the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958 [hereinafter referred to as the “Act”] has held that this is a conscious omission. It was held that the High Court is not expected to substitute and supplant its view with that of the learned Trial Court, its only role is to satisfy itself on the process adopted. Thus, the scope of revisionary jurisdiction of this Court has been limited to examine if there is an error apparent on the face of the record or absence of any adjudication by the learned Trial Court, and it is only then should the High Court interfere. The Supreme Court has also cautioned from converting the power of superintendence into that of a regular first Appeal under revisionary jurisdiction. This has been elucidated at length by Supreme Court in *Abid-Ul-Islam* case in the following manner:

"Scope of revision

22. We are, in fact, more concerned with the scope and ambit of the proviso to Section 25-B(8). The proviso creates a distinct and unequivocal embargo by not providing an appeal against the order passed by the learned Rent Controller over an application filed under sub-section (5). The intendment of the legislature is very clear, which is to remove the appellate remedy and thereafter, a further second appeal. It is a clear omission that is done by the legislature consciously through a covenant removing the right of two stages of appeals.

23. The proviso to Section 25-B(8) gives the High Court exclusive power of revision against an order of the learned Rent Controller,

⁷ (2022) 6 SCC 30



being in the nature of superintendence over an inferior court on the decision-making process, inclusive of procedural compliance. **Thus, the High Court is not expected to substitute and supplant its views with that of the trial court by exercising the appellate jurisdiction. Its role is to satisfy itself on the process adopted. The scope of interference by the High Court is very restrictive and except in cases where there is an error apparent on the face of the record,** which would only mean that in the absence of any adjudication per se, the High Court should not venture to disturb such a decision. There is no need for holding a roving inquiry in such matters which would otherwise **amount to converting the power of superintendence into that of a regular first appeal, an act, totally forbidden by the legislature.**

xxx

25. The aforesaid decision has been recently considered and approved by this Court in Mohd. Inam v. Sanjay Kumar Singhal [Mohd. Inam v. Sanjay Kumar Singhal, (2020) 7 SCC 327 : (2020) 4 SCC (Civ) 107] : (SCC pp. 340-41, paras 22-23)

“22. This Court in Sarla Ahuja v. United India Insurance Co. Ltd. [Sarla Ahuja v. United India Insurance Co. Ltd., (1998) 8 SCC 119] had an occasion to consider the scope of proviso to Section 25-B(8) of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958. This Court found, that though the word “revision” was not employed in the said proviso, from the language used therein, the legislative intent was clear that the power conferred was revisional power. This Court observed thus : (SCC p. 124, para 11)

‘11. The learned Single Judge of the High Court in the present case has reassessed and reappraised the evidence afresh to reach a different finding as though it was exercising appellate jurisdiction. No doubt even while exercising revisional jurisdiction, a reappraisal of evidence can be made, but that should be for the limited purpose to ascertain whether the conclusion arrived at by the fact-finding court is wholly unreasonable.’

It could thus be seen, that this Court has held, that the High Court while exercising the revisional powers under the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958 though could not reassess and reappraise the evidence, as if it was exercising appellate jurisdiction, however, it was empowered to reappraise the evidence for the limited purpose so as to ascertain whether the conclusion arrived at by the fact-finding court is wholly unreasonable.

23. Again in Ram Narain Arora v. Asha Rani [Ram Narain Arora v. Asha Rani, (1999) 1 SCC 141] , this Court had an occasion to consider the aforesaid powers under the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958. This Court observed thus : (SCC p. 148, para



12)

'12. It is no doubt true that the scope of a revision petition under Section 25-B(8) proviso of the Delhi Rent Control Act is a very limited one, but even so in examining the legality or propriety of the proceedings before the Rent Controller, the High Court could examine the facts available in order to find out whether he had correctly or on a firm legal basis approached the matters on record to decide the case. Pure findings of fact may not be open to be interfered with, but (sic if) in a given case, the finding of fact is given on a wrong premise of law, certainly it would be open to the Revisional Court to interfere with such a matter.'

It was thus held, that though the scope of revisional powers of the High Court was very limited one, but even so in examining the legality or propriety of the proceedings before the Rent Controller, the High Court could examine the facts available in order to find out whether he had correctly or on a firm legal basis approached the matters on record to decide the case. It has also been held, that pure findings of fact may not be open to be interfered with, but in a given case, if the finding of fact is given on a wrong premise of law, it would be open to the Revisional Court to interfere with the same."

[Emphasis is ours]

11. The provisions of the Act provide for a remedy of restoration of possession to a Petitioner/tenant in one situation, i.e., under Section 19 of the Act. In cases allowed under Section 14(1)(e) of the Act, the recovery of possession by a tenant under Section 19(1) of the Act can be obtained if the landlord re-let the whole or part of the subject premises within three years from the date of obtaining possession from the evicted tenant. Sub-section (2) of Section 19 of the Act further provides that where such premises are not occupied within two months by landlord or within three years from the date of possession by the person for whose benefit the premises are held, or are re-let to a person without permission of the Rent Controller within three years from the date of possession, the Rent Controller may direct the landlord to put the tenant in possession or pay him such compensation as is



deemed fit by the Rent Controller. Section 19 of the Act is set out below:

“19. Recovery of possession for occupation and re-entry.—(1) Where a landlord recovers possession of any premises from the tenant in pursuance of an order made under clause (e) of the proviso to sub-section (1) of section 14 [or under sections 14A, 14B, 14C, 14D and 21, the landlord shall not, except with the permission of the Controller obtained in the prescribed manner, re-let the whole or any part of the premises within three years from the date of obtaining such possession, and in granting such permission, the Controller may direct the landlord to put such evicted tenant in possession of the premises.

(2) Where a landlord recovers possession of any premises as aforesaid and the premises are not occupied by the landlord or by the person for whose benefit the premises are held, within two months of obtaining such possession, or the premises having been so occupied are, at any time within three years from the date of obtaining possession, re-let to any person other than the evicted tenant without obtaining the permission of the Controller under sub-section (1) or the possession of such premises is transferred to another person for reasons which do not appear to the Controller to be bona fide, the Controller may, on an application made to him in this behalf by such evicted tenant within such time as may be prescribed, direct the landlord to put the tenant in possession of the premises or to pay him such compensation as the Controller thinks fit.”

11.1 The Supreme Court in ***Abid-Ul-Islam*** case has held that Section 19 of the Act gives a right of re-possession to the dispossessed tenant if landlord recovers possession under Section 14(1)(e) of the Act and thereafter, the landlord does not use the subject premises for the purpose that it was intended and set out in such Eviction Petition on which basis, an order for eviction was obtained by the landlord. The relevant extract is set out below:

*“19. Before a presumption is drawn, the landlord is duty-bound to place prima facie material supported by the adequate averments. It is only thereafter, the presumption gets attracted and the onus shifts on the tenant. The object of Section 14(1)(e) vis-à-vis Section 25-B has to be seen in the light of yet another provision contained under Section 19. **Section 19 gives a right to the dispossessed tenant for repossession if there is a non-compliance on the part of the landlord albeit after eviction, to put the premises to use for the intended purpose. Such a***



2024:DHC:8444



right is available only to a tenant who stood dispossessed on the application filed by the landlord invoking Section 14(1)(e) being allowed. Thus, Section 19 inter alia throws more light on the legislative objective facilitating a speedy possession. The object is also reflected in the proviso to Section 25-B(8), denying a right of appeal..”

[Emphasis Supplied]

12. The Eviction Petition was filed by three Respondents/landlords under Section 14(1)(e) of the Act, setting out the requirement for their entire family. The total family members of these three Respondents/landlords are 21 in number, which comprises of their respective wives, sons and daughters. It is contended that there are no separate rooms for themselves, their guests like married daughters, separate drawing rooms and servant rooms, etc. and that they are compelled to squeeze themselves into the accommodation available. It was further contended that there is no suitable alternate accommodation as the properties mentioned by the Petitioner/tenant are either in possession of other tenants or do not belong to the Respondents/landlords but other legal heirs of their grandfather. The proceedings were contested by the Petitioner/tenant and an eviction order was passed by the learned Trial Court after examining all the contentions raised by the Petitioner/tenant.

12.1 Similar orders were passed in connected RC.REV. 295/2018, RC.REV. 300/2018, RC.REV. 302/2018, RC.REV. 303/2018, RC.REV. 306/2018, RC.REV. 310/2018 and RC.REV. 312/2018 directing that 1/2 rooms be vacated. However, keeping in mind that the requirement, as stated in the Petition, of the 3 Respondents/landlords and their 21 family members is there, which is undisputed, the Impugned Order does not require



2024:DHC:8444



interference.

12.2 After the passing of the Impugned Order, 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. This was recorded by the Court in its orders dated 14.09.2018 and thereafter on 29.04.2024. In these circumstances, the Revision Petition has become infructuous.

13. As stated above, the jurisdiction of this Court exercising revisionary powers is limited and circumspect. The Petitioner/tenant did not initiate appropriate civil proceedings for recovery of possession of the tenanted premises. The Petitioner/tenant has also not contended that Section 19 of Act 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.

14. Parties will act based on digitally signed copy of the order.

TARA VITASTA GANJU, J

OCTOBER 29, 2024/pa