



\$~9

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

+ RC.REV. 175/2021, CM APPL. 46541/2021

SH. VINOD KUMAR ANAND

.....Petitioner

Through: Dr. Amit George, Mr. Shreesh
Chadha, Mr. Aman Singh Bakshi
and Mr. Dushyant Kaul, Advs.

versus

MRS. AMARJYOT & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. B.S. Dhir, Ms. Shuchi Sood,
Mr. Harshit Chopra, Ms. Ashmeet
Kaur, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER
22.12.2025

%

1. In compliance of the last order dated 01.12.2025, the collective cost of Rs.10,000/- has already been paid by the respondents, receipt whereof, has been handed over in Court and the same is taken on record.
2. Learned counsel for the parties have addressed their arguments on merits after taking this Court through the judgment passed by the Additional Rent Controller (West District) Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi (**learned ARC**) as also the various document(s) on record.
3. The records reveal that this is a case wherein the learned ARC has passed the impugned judgment dated 28.11.2019 after the application seeking leave to defend of the tenant had already been allowed and the parties had filed their respective written statement/ replication as also substantive document(s) followed by the affidavit in evidence(s), after



which cross-examination of their respective witnesses were also conducted in the form of a full-fledged trial followed by the final arguments addressed by the learned counsel for the parties therein.

4. However, as agreed by learned counsel for the parties, a bare perusal of the impugned judgment dated 28.11.2019 reveals that despite the aforesaid, there is no consideration of the document(s), more particularly of the evidence(s)/ cross-examination(s) of the witnesses of the both the parties as there is no iota of mention thereof, barring mere references thereto.

5. Therefore, as held in ***Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited vs. Dilbahar Singh***: (2014) 9 SCC 78 **and** ***Abid-Ul-Islam vs. Inder Sain Dua***: (2022) 6 SCC 30, this Court in exercise of its revisional jurisdiction under *Section 25B (8)* of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958, deems it appropriate to remand the present petition before the learned ARC to pass a fresh judgment taking into consideration all the material(s) in the form of the pleadings, the document(s), the evidence(s) of all the witnesses on record, after hearing the final arguments to be addressed by learned counsel for the parties in an expeditious manner, preferably within a time frame of *three months*.

6. Learned counsel for the parties agree that they shall only restrict to addressing the final arguments/ contest only on the basis of the record(s) available before the learned ARC without leading any (further) evidence thereon.

7. Needless to mention, learned counsel for the parties shall not be taking any undue/ unnecessary adjournments, save and accept, in



exceptional circumstance(s) to be determined by the learned ARC.

8. The present petition alongwith the pending application is disposed of with the aforesaid observations.

9. A copy of the present order be sent to the learned Principal District and Session Judge, Tis Hazari Courts, West District, Delhi.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

DECEMBER 22, 2025/So