



\$~12

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

+ RC.REV. 375/2025, CM APPL. 73845/2025, CM APPL. 73846/2025
& CM APPL. 73847/2025

AVTAR SINGH BHATIA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, Mr. Kunal Sachdeva, Mr. Balwinder Singh Suri, Ms. Katyayni V., Mr. Nishant Walia & Mr. Lakshay Yadav, Advs.

versus

ASHOK SAPRA

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Aroshi Pal, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

16.02.2026

%

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

“a. Pass orders calling for the entire records of the petition filed under Section 14(1)(e) r/w Section 25B of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958, bearing the title *Ashok Sapra vs. Avtar Singh Bhatia* bearing number RC ARC 376/23 decided by the Learned Additional Rent Controller-01, Central District, Tis Hazari Courts, New Delhi; and,

b. Set aside the Impugned Order dated 13.06.2025, whereby the Learned Additional Rent Controller-01, Central District, Tis Hazari Courts, New Delhi, rejected the leave to defend application filed by the Revisionist and consequently granted an eviction order under Section 14(1)(e) read with Section 25B of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958, in favour of the Respondent concerning the rented premises, being the commercial unit bearing No. XIII-5124, Harphool Singh Building, Clock Tower,



Subzi Mandi, Delhi – 110007, India; and,
c. Hear the present petition and decide based on the facts and circumstances brought forth; and,
d. Pass any other order as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case.”

3. Vide order dated 24.11.2025, the learned Predecessor Bench of this Court passed the following directions:-

“18. *Ergo*, in view of the aforesaid analysis, this Court finds no reason for interfering with the well-reasoned and detailed findings arrived by the learned ARC in the impugned order, which, thus is liable to be upheld.

19. However, at this stage, learned counsel for the tenant seeks and is granted, a period of *two weeks* to seek instructions qua the feasible time period within which the tenant would vacate the subject premises and hand over the possession thereof to the landlord, along with the terms of payment *qua* user and occupation charges for the concerned period.”

4. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that the aforesaid order was challenged by way of SLP (C) No. 38158/2025, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court while disposing of the said appeal *vide* order dated 11.02.2026 passed the following directions:-

“5. The appellant shall furnish an undertaking before this Court to vacate the premises on or before 28th February, 2027. The undertaking, in the usual form, shall be filed by the appellant within three weeks from today, failing which, the Registry shall take appropriate steps.

6. The appellant, through learned counsel present in Court, has been made aware of the consequences of breach of such undertaking(s), including initiation of contempt proceedings.

7. The arrears of rent due and payable, if any, shall be positively cleared within three weeks from today.

8. Needless to add, till such time the appellant occupies the premises, he shall continue to pay occupational charges at the



same rate at which the rent was agreed to be paid.”

5. In view of the above, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the present petition.
6. Leave granted.
7. The present petition is dismissed as withdrawn and disposed of accordingly.
8. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

FEBRUARY 16, 2026/nk/sg