



\$~14

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
RC.REV. 44/2020, CM APPL. 2423/2020, CM APPL. 68538/2024
BALDEV RAJPetitioner

Through: None

versus

DULI CHANDRespondent
Through: Mr. Pradeep Solanki, Advocate
(through VC)

15

+ RC.REV. 46/2020 & CM APPL. 2544/2020, CM APPL.
68540/2024

KANTA (SINCE DECEASED) THR LRSPetitioner

Through: None

versus

DULI CHANDRespondent
Through: Mr. Pradeep Solanki, Advocate
(through VC)

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER
10.11.2025

%

1. There is no appearance on behalf of the petitioners/ tenants. Same was the position on the last date of hearing.
2. Learned counsel for the respondent/ landlord appearing through video conferencing submits that pursuant to orders passed by the learned Executing Court, the vacant, peaceful and physical possession of the subject premises has already been handed over to the landlord on 17.09.2025.



3. As such, relying upon *N.C. Daga vs. Inder Mohan Singh Rana* [2003(1) SCC 453] and *Vinod Kumar Verma vs. Manmohan Verma & Anr.* [Civil Appeal Nos.5220-5221 of 2008, order dated 19.08.2008], learned counsel submits that the present petitions have become infructuous as there is nothing remaining therein.

4. In view of the above, the present petitions, alongwith the pending application(s), stands disposed of.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J.

NOVEMBER 10, 2025/So