



\$~64 to 66

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

RC.REV. 172/2025, CM APPL. 33211/2025-Stay, CM APPL.
33212/2025-Exp.

MADAN LALPetitioner

Through: Mr. Om Prakash, Adv.

versus

MOHD YUNUSRespondent

Through: Mr. Anil Panwar, Adv. (through
VC)

65

+ RC.REV. 173/2025, CM APPL. 33471/2025-Stay, CM APPL.
33472/2025-Exp.

JAI KISHANPetitioner

Through: Mr. Om Prakash, Adv.

versus

MOHD YUNUSRespondent

Through: Mr. Anil Panwar, Adv. (through
VC)

66

RC.REV. 178/2025, CM APPL. 34504/2025-Stay, CM APPL.
34505/2025-Exp.

SANJAY & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Om Prakash, Adv.

versus

MOHD YUNUSRespondent

Through: Mr. Anil Panwar, Adv. (through
VC)



CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER
26.09.2025

%

1. There is no dispute *qua* the fact that the subject premises has since been handed over to the respondent in view of the orders passed by the learned Executing Court.
2. Therefore, in view of the settled position of law laid down in *N.C. Daga v. Inder Mohan Singh Rana* [2003 (1) SCC 453] and *Vinod Kumar Verma v. Manmohan Verma & Anr.* [Civil Appeal Nos.5220-5221 of 2008 order dated 19.08.2008], the present petitions have become infructuous and there is nothing surviving therein.
3. Accordingly, the present petitions alongwith the pending applications stand disposed of.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

SEPTEMBER 26, 2025/bh