



\$~80

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CM(M) 82/2021 & CM APPL. 3516/2021**
RIYAZ AHMAD ALIAS RAJU

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Yogesh Gaur and Ms. Seema
Saini, Advocates.

versus

RAJENDER

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Ravi Bassi, Mr. Nitin Kumar and
Mr. Akshat Dhawan, Advocates.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

06.08.2025

%

1. The Petitioner herein is a tenant who is defending an eviction petition filed on the ground of *bona fide* requirement, as contemplated under Section 14(1)(e) of Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958.
2. The tenant is aggrieved by order dated 25.11.2020 passed by learned Rent Control Tribunal whereby the eviction petition in question has been permitted to be revived.
3. After hearing arguments for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner, however, does not press the present petition.
4. It is noticed that when the matter was taken up on the last date, a proposal came from the side of the respondent/landlord whereby it was divulged that though there was some delay in filing *application seeking leave to defend* but the landlord would have no objection if such delay is ignored and the learned Trial Court takes up the abovesaid application seeking leave

CM(M) 82/2021

1



to defend and considers the same on merits.

5. In view of above, let the above application seeking leave to defend be considered on merits.

6. Since the landlord is yet to file response to the abovesaid application, he would ensure that the same is filed without any further delay. Once any such reply is filed, it will be open to the tenant to file *rejoinder affidavit*, in response thereto.

7. Since the eviction petition in question was filed in the year 2018, learned Controller is requested to give requisite priority to the disposal of the abovesaid application whereby the tenant is seeking leave to defend.

8. The present petition is disposed of as not pressed in aforesaid terms.

9. Pending application also stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

10. All rights and contentions of the parties are reserved.

11. It is also clarified that this Court has not made any observation with respect to the merits of the abovesaid application whereby the tenant is seeking leave to defend.

MANOJ JAIN, J

AUGUST 6, 2025/ss/js