



\$~11

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

+ **W.P.(C) 17700/2025 & CM APPL. 73121/2025**

HARVINDER SINGH BATRA & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rana S. Biswas, Mr. Yash
Tripathi & Mr. Kartik Chettiar,
Advocates.

versus

INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Divye Chugh, Ms. Priya
Wadhwa, Mr. Rachit Raushan, Mr.
Angel Bharadwaj & Ms. Hazel
Bharadwaj, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% 14.01.2026

1. The petition is for the following relief:

“a) Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction directing the Respondents to forthwith release to the Petitioners the arrears of rent/occupation charges as per mutual agreement for the property bearing Municipal No. CB-202, Naraina admeasuring 12,000 sq. fts, situated at Village Naraina, Ring Road, New Delhi with effect from 15.02.2021 till date, along with interest at such rate as this Hon’ble Court deems fit and proper;

b) Issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction directing the Respondents to execute and register the fresh lease deed in respect of the aforesaid premises with the Petitioners for the agreed tenure and on the agreed terms and conditions, reflected in the draft lease deed circulated by the Respondents dated 28.11.2022 in continuation of the lease that expired on 15.02.2021;

c) Declare that the Respondents are estopped from denying or



disputing the Petitioners' title to the premises under Section 116 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872 (now Section 122 of the Bharatiya Sakshya Adhiniyam, 2023) and are under a continuing obligation to pay rent/occupation charges so long as they remain in possession;

d) Quash and set aside the impugned communications dated 29.11.2023 and 28.02.2025 issued by the Respondents purporting to dispute the Petitioners' title and refusing payment of rent/occupation charges."

2. The grievance of the petitioners seems to be of non-payment of the rent. Though learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, tries to emphasize that there is no dispute with respect to tenancy and ownership of the petitioners. However, by way of counter-affidavit filed by the respondents it has been unequivocally stated that the petition is not maintainable as it involves serious disputed question of fact regarding title, acquisition and possession of the suit property.
3. According to the respondents, the lease of 1969, expired in 2012. The parties agreed to a fresh lease. Stamp paper and demand draft were prepared but registration could not take place because the Sub-Registrar objected to unclear ownership of khasra no 992/2, 993, 2056/994., etc.
4. Under the aforesaid circumstances, the Court is not inclined to entertain the instant writ petition and to undertake the enquiry with respect to the ownership or the disputed question of facts which have emerged.
5. Under these circumstances, the liberty is granted to file the civil suit.
6. Accordingly, the petition stands disposed of. All pending application shall also stand disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

JANUARY 14, 2026

tr/ap