



\$~55

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **RC.REV. 138/2024**

RS SHARMA (DECEASED) THROUGH LRSPetitioner

Through: Mr. Abhijat, Sr. Advocate with Ms. Suruchi Mittal, Mr. Harshvardhan Gupta and Mr. Ujjawal Tripathi, Advocates.

versus

AJAY KOHLI & ORS.Respondent

Through: Mr. Lovkesh Sawhney, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Parminder S. Bhullar, Mr. Kartik Dhingra, Mr. Rohit Kumar, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

22.12.2025

%

CM 80886/2025 (By petitioner for modification of order dt. 10.12.2025)

1. The petitioner, *vide* the present application, seeks modification of *paragraph 8* of the order dated 10.12.2025 since it is his case that the vacation of the subject premises was agreed upon for, on or before 31.03.2026 and not before the next date of hearing.
2. This Court without going into the merits of the same, allows the present application. As such, *paragraph 8* of the order dated 10.12.2025 is modified to read as under:-

*“8. However, at this stage, learned senior counsel for the tenant submits that the tenant is willing to unconditionally apologise for his conduct as also to pay the previous costs accumulating to Rs.70,000/- as also that the tenant is also ready to vacate the subject premises and hand over physical and peaceful possession to the landlord **on or before***



31.03.2026''

3. Accordingly, the application is disposed of.

4. Needless to say, the order dated 10.12.2025 shall be read in conjunction with the present order.

RC.REV. 138/2024, CM APPL. 45644/2024, CM APPL. 3258/2025 & CM APPL. 74766/2025

5. Upon query, learned senior counsel for landlord, upon instructions submits that the tenant has not yet paid the user and occupation charges since and from October, 2025 in terms of the order dated 13.05.2025. Not only that, the tenant has not paid a penny in compliance thereof towards the water and electricity charges. It is also unclear if the tenant has not paid the previous costs imposed by this Court as there is no proof thereof. Further, today also the tenant is not present in Court.

6. Considering the nature of the dispute involved, as also the repeated conduct(s) of the tenant as borne out from the collective readings of the last orders dated 06.10.2025, 18.11.2025, 28.11.2025 and 10.12.2025, this Court does not see any reason for continuing with the present petition. Therefore, to save the precious and valuable time of this Court, as also in view of the aforesaid earlier orders passed by this Court, and as the tenant has nothing to argue further, there is no reason for this Court to keep the present petition pending.

7. As such, the present revision petition is dismissed along with the pending applications.

8. Resultantly, since the statutory period of *six months* granted by the learned ARC to the tenant by virtue of *Section 14 (7)* of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958 in the impugned order dated 17.11.2023, has already



expired, the tenant is directed to vacate the subject premises for handing over the peaceful and physical possession thereof in compliance of the order dated 17.11.2023 to the landlord.

9. Needless to say, the aforesaid order shall not preclude the landlord to pursue/ proceed with CS/SCJ/427/2024 already pending before the ACJ-CCJ-ARC, South East, Saket, New Delhi instituted by respondent/ landlord against the petitioner/ tenant with respect to the dues/ user and occupation charges, as also, also for further future arrears/ dues *qua* the aforesaid against the petitioner/ tenant.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

DECEMBER 22, 2025/NA