



\$~40

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

+ **RSA 217/2025 & CM APPL. 81016/2025**

MS. BABITA

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Anand Singh and Mr. Kartik
Malhotra, Advocates.

versus

MRS. CHANDER PRABHA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Prakhar sharma, Ms. Riya Verma,
Ms. Ruchika Kumari, Ms. Piya Uppal
and Mr. Ayush Malik, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

%

17.02.2026

1. Vide Order dated 22.12.2025 a Notice was issued to the Respondent only in respect of the time to be given to the Appellant to vacate the Suit property.
2. Learned counsel for the Appellant states that the Appellant be given six month's time. It is submitted that the Respondent and the Appellant are the relatives and the Respondent being the sister-in-law of the Appellant. It is, therefore, submitted that six months' time may be given.
3. It is submitted that the premises of the Appellant are under construction and it would take about one year to get completed and at least six months' time be given to vacate the Suit property.
4. Learned counsel on behalf of the Respondent submits that the Appellant is employed in Steel Authority of India and is a lady of means. The Eviction Order was passed by the learned Trial court in 2014 and thereafter, the Order of Eviction was affirmed in the Regular First Appeal



vide Judgment dated 29.05.2025, wherein 45 days time was given for eviction. It is submitted that considering that its' an old litigation, the Respondent is not inclined to give the time, as claimed by the Appellant.

5. Considering the circumstances and balancing equities, the Appellant is given three months' time from today to vacate the premises failing which the Respondent is at liberty to pursue her Execution.

6. The Appeal is accordingly disposed of.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

FEBRUARY 17, 2026/va