



\$~17 & 18

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

+ **RC.REV. 226/2024 & CM APPL.48753/2024**

SAMEER SETHPetitioner

Through: Mr. Vinay Mishra, Advocate.

versus

VINITA JAIN AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Lalwani, Advocate.

+ **RC.REV. 227/2024 & CM APPL. 48755/2024**

SAMEER SETHPetitioner

Through: Mr. Vinay Mishra, Advocate.

versus

VINITA JAINRespondent

Through: Mr. Sunil Lalwani, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU

ORDER

%

13.01.2025

1. Learned Counsel for the parties submit that the possession of the subject premises has already been taken by the Respondents through execution proceedings.
2. Learned Counsel for the Respondents, thus, submits that since the possession of the subject premises has been restored, nothing further survives in the present Petitions and the Petitions have become infructuous.
3. In this regard, reliance is placed upon the judgment passed by this



Court in *Ashok Gupta v. Deepak Rao*¹, which has relied upon the Judgments of the Supreme Court in *NC Daga v. Inder Mohan Singh Rana*² and *Vinod Kumar Verma v. Manmohan Verma*³. This Court is supported in its view by judgments passed by Coordinate Benches of this Court including *Om Prakash Ashok Kumar & Sons v. Ajay Khurana*⁴, *Neelam Sharma v. Ekant Rekhan*⁵, and *Bhawani Shankar v Nand Lal and Ors.*⁶.

4. In addition, it is contended that the Petitioner is adequately protected in terms of Section 19(1) of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958.

5. The present Petitions are accordingly disposed off in terms of the foregoing decisions.

TARA VITASTA GANJU, J

JANUARY 13, 2025/ ha

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)

¹ 2024 SCC OnLine Del 7148

² (2003) 1 SCC 453

³ Civil Appeal Nos. 5220-5221 of 2008 dated 19.08.2008

⁴ 2024 SCC OnLine Del 5228

⁵ 2019 SCC Online Del 6487

⁶ 2021 SCC OnLine Del 4284