



\$~67

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

RC.REV. 67/2025 & CM Appls.11580-82/2025

ZEESHAN AHMED

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. B.B. Gupta, Sr. Adv. with Mr.
Shobhana Takiar, SC with Mr.
Prateek Dhir, Mr. Kuljeet Singh and
Mr. Shriram Takiar, Adv.

versus

HUSNA AHMED & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ramesh Kumar, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

ORDER

27.02.2025

%

1. The Petitioner appears in person.
2. This Court had on 25.02.2025 after examining the matter given a *prima facie* finding that there is no infirmity with the Impugned Order.
3. Learned Senior Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the only clarification that the Petitioner seeks today is that the order passed by the learned Trial Court must not be construed as a declaration of title in favour of the Respondents.
- 3.1 Learned Counsel for the Respondents, submits that he has no objection if such an observation is made by the Court.
4. In any event, so far as concerns the concept of ownership under the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958, the same is very different from the ownership *qua* the title of a premises. The law is settled in that behalf.
5. Accordingly, without prejudice to the rights and contentions and with the consent of the parties, the Petition is disposed of. All pending Applications stand closed. However, it is clarified that any finding of



ownership *qua* the subject premises in the Impugned Order shall not come in the way of the inter-se proceedings filed by the Petitioner. All rights and contentions of both parties are left open in this regard.

6. The parties will act based on the digitally signed copy of the order.

TARA VITASTA GANJU, J

FEBRUARY 27, 2025/r

Click here to check corrigendum, if any