



\$~14

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

+ **RC.REV. 243/2025 & CM APPL. 50859/2025**

SH.RAM AVTAR SHARMAPetitioner

Through: None.

versus

SMT. ALKA SHARMARespondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

% **24.04.2026**

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

“ Under the facts and circumstances, it is respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble court may please to set aside the order dated 09/07/2025 p..ssed by the court of Sh. Vivek Kumar Agarwal, ARC-02, Controller (central district), Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi in petition no. 296 of 2014 titled as ALKA SHARMA VS. RAM AVTAR SHARMA and revision of the petitioner be admitted in the form of granting leave to defend in favour of the petitioner, in the interest of justice.

Any other relief which this Hon'ble court may deem fit and proper be also passed in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent.”

3. *Vide* order dated 19.08.2025, learned Predecessor Bench of this Court made the following observations:-

“6. In any event, as per trite law for the purpose of proceeding



under *Section 14(1)(e)* read with *Section 25B* of the Delhi Rent Control Act 1958, a landlord is not supposed to prove absolute ownership as required under Transfer of Property Act, 1882 and he/ she is only required to show that he/ she is more than a tenant. Moreover, any issue *qua* the ownership has to be decided in appropriate proceeding and the same is not available for the tenant as a defence in such proceedings.

7. In view of the aforesaid, the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the respondent is not the owner of the property falls flat.

8. After some arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks, and is granted, a period of *four weeks* for reverting with appropriate instructions *qua* the feasible time period within which the petitioner would be able to vacate the subject property, as well as the terms of payment/ user charges the petitioner is willing to pay to the respondent for the extended period.”

4. None appears on behalf of the petitioner today. There has been no appearance on behalf of the petitioner on last two dates of hearing as well *i.e.* 16.10.2025 and 02.02.2026. Even the process fee has not been filed by the petitioner.

5. The present petition is dismissed in default for non-prosecution and disposed of accordingly.

6. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

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

AMIT SHARMA, J

APRIL 24, 2026/nk/sg