



\$~25

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

+ **RC.REV. 125/2026 & CM APPL. 24624-27/2026**

M/S VICTOR TRADERSPetitioner

Through: Mr. Divye Puri, Adv.

versus

GAGAN GUPTARespondent

Through: Mr. Arun Birbal, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

% **21.05.2026**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition under Section 25 B (8) of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958, seeks the following prayers: -

“(a) set aside the impugned Order and Judgement dated 13.11.2025 passed by Sh. Vivek Kumar Agarwal, Additional Rent Controller-2(Central), Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi in RC ARC No. 480899/2016 titled as 'Gagan Gupta vs M/s Victor Traders';

(b) call for the record of the Eviction Petition being RC ARC No. 480899/2016 titled as "Gagan Gupta vs M/s Victor Traders" decided by the Ld. ARC-2(Central), Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi,

(c) remand back the present case to the Ld. ARC for fresh consideration on the aspect of bonafide requirement of the Respondent on the basis of the available material on record;”

3. On 24.04.2026, this Court had passed the following order: -

“3. During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions from the latter, submits that reasonable time may be given to vacate the subject premises and cost of Rs.



50,000/- imposed by the learned JSCC on him vide impugned order dated 13.11.2025 may be waived off.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent has no objection to the same.

5. In these circumstances, let the petitioner file an affidavit of undertaking that he shall vacate the property on or before 30.11.2026 before the next date of hearing.

6. Renotify on 21.05.2026.”

4. In pursuance, thereof, an affidavit of undertaking dated 18.05.2026 had been placed on record by the petitioner, wherein it has been stated as under: -

“1. That I am the Proprietor of the Petitioner in the above-mentioned Petition and I am fully conversant with the facts and circumstances of the case and able to depose to the same.

2. This Hon'ble Court vide Order dated 24.04.2026 granted time to the Petitioner to vacate the demised premises either on or before 30.11.2026.

3. In terms of the aforementioned Order, the Petitioner undertakes to vacate the demised premises on or before 30.11.2026.”

5. In view of the above, learned counsel for the petitioner does not wish to press the present petition on merits, except for the directions in the order dated 13.11.2025 imposing the cost of Rs. 50,000/- on the petitioner.

6. In these circumstances, the cost of Rs. 50,000/-, imposed on the petitioner is waived off .

7. In view of the above, the petition is disposed of as not pressed.

8. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

9. Needless to state that the petitioner shall abide by the aforesaid affidavit of undertaking given before this Court.



10. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court, *forthwith*.

AMIT SHARMA, J

MAY 21, 2026/kr/db