



\$~23 and 24

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

+ RC.REV. 309/2024, CM APPL. 64443/2024-Stay

OM PRAKASH

.....Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

RAVI GUPTA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Alankar Tewari, Adv. (through
VC)

24

RC.REV. 310/2024, CM APPL. 64488/2024-Stay

TRIBHUVAN SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: None.

versus

RAVI GUPTA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Alankar Tewari, Adv. (through
VC)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

%

15.09.2025

1. There is no appearance on behalf of the petitioner(s).
2. Mr. Alankar Tewari, Advocate, appearing on behalf of the respondent submits he has already filed his *Vakalatnama*, which is on record.
3. Learned counsel for the respondent reiterates his submissions made on 14.08.2025 that since the petitioners/ landlords has already taken



possession of the subject premises, the present petitions have become infructuous.

4. As such, as also considering the dicta of Hon'ble Supreme Court 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 are *per se* not maintainable.

5. In view of the above, the present petition(s) alongwith the pending applications having rendered infructuous stands disposed of.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

SEPTEMBER 15, 2025/bh