



\$~88

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CM(M) 1011/2025, CM APPL. 33473/2025, CM APPL. 33474/2025,
CM APPL. 33475/2025, CM APPL. 33476/2025 & CM APPL.
33477/2025
PARMINDER SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Siddharth Aggarwal, Advocate.

versus

MEENU SINGH AND ORS.

.....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

ORDER

28.08.2025

%

1. Petitioner is defending an eviction petition filed on the ground of *bona fide* requirement.
2. The case is, now reportedly, at the stage final arguments.
3. When the landlord examined PW-2-Ms. Urvashi Singh, tenant took objection *qua* certain documents and also with respect to certain averments made in her affidavit, while contending that these were beyond pleadings.
4. He submits that when his application under Section 151 CPC, which had been moved with the prayer that such documents, which had been placed on record without any permission from the Court be directed to be taken off the record, the learned Trial Court has dismissed the abovesaid application on 14.05.2025 and while dismissing, it also observed that there was no change in the need raised by the landlords in their petition.
5. After hearing arguments for some time, he submits that since the

CM(M) 1011/2025

1



objections have already been left open, to be adjudicated at the time of final arguments, he would not press the present petition, but it be clarified that such the objections are decided by the learned Controller without being influenced by the observations appearing in the impugned order.

6. The present petition is, accordingly, disposed of as not pressed, with the clarification that any objection taken in this regard would be considered by the learned Controller in accordance with law, without being influenced by the order which is impugned herein.

7. The pending applications also stand disposed of in aforesaid terms.

MANOJ JAIN, J

AUGUST 28, 2025/ss/shs