



\$~63

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

+ RC.REV. 218/2020

PARSHOTTAM LAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Inder Bir Singh Alag, Sr. Adv.
alongwith Mr. Jagdeep Singh
Lamba and Mr. R. S. Bisht, Advts.

versus

NEW LIGHT TRADING COMPANY & ORS.Respondents

Through: Counsel (appearance not given)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

% **09.01.2026**

CM APPL. 1319/2026 (By petitioner seeking corrections in the judgment dated 23.12.2025)

1. By virtue of the present application, the petitioner seeks correction of the typographical mistakes/ errors in the *paragraph nos.1, 5, 6, 8 and 46* of the judgment dated 23.12.2025 passed by this Court.

2. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed. Accordingly, paragraph nos. nos.1, 5, 6 and 46 reads as under:-

*“1. The petitioner/ landlord filed the Eviction Petition, E. No. 77684/2016, before the learned Rent Controller, **Central** District, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi, against the respondents/ tenants being two companies and their respective directors, qua the premises bearing Shop No.520, Ground Floor, Katra Ishwar Bhawan, Khari Baoli, Delhi-110006.*

xxx

xxx

xxx

5. After evidence was led by both parties, the learned RC heard both the parties and thence proceeded to pass the order dated 10.07.2020 dismissing the Eviction Petition of the landlord.

6. Hence, the present petition filed by the landlord seeking setting aside the impugned order dated 10.07.2020 passed by the learned RC.

xxx

xxx

xxx



46. *In view of the aforesaid analysis and findings, wherein the very threshold under Section 14(1)(e) read with Section 25B of the Act has been breached in view of the findings rendered by the learned RC, this is a case calling for interference by this Court. As such, the impugned order dated 10.07.2020 passed by the learned RC cannot be allowed to prevail, and is hereby set aside.”*

3. At the same time, considering the nature of the correction sought by the petitioner in *paragraph no.8* of the judgment dated 23.12.2025 wherein, as per him, his contention has been wrongly recorded as “...even though the Sale Deed (*Ex. PW1/1*) based whereon the landlord was claiming title was not attested by two witnesses, however, since the same was a duly registered and valid document with all the necessary specifications, there was no lacuna in the title of the landlord...”, whereas his contention was that the said Sale Deed was *witnessed* by two witnesses, of whom one was the practising Advocate, this Court is of the view that the same has no bearing to the findings rendered by this Court, particularly since it was never the case of the petitioner that the said Sale Deed was, in fact, attested, as also since the roving inquiry into the said Sale Deed has been held beyond the jurisdiction of the learned RC, and the issue of *landlord-tenant relationship* has been decided in favour of the petitioner *vide* the judgment dated 23.12.2025.

4. Accordingly, the present application is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

5. Needless to say, the judgment dated 23.12.2025 shall be read in conjunction with this order.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

JANUARY 9, 2026/bh