

16.03.2026

This is fresh Appeal under Section 38 of Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958. It be checked and registered.

Present:- Ms. Suhani Advocate via video conferencing submits that she is Counsel for Appellant Om Prakash.

Heard. Perused.

Vakalatnama at page 67 of the paper book of appeal does not find mention of name of Ms. Suhani, Advocate as appointed counsel by the appellant. In said Vakalatnama, the appellant has appointed Sh. Shalabh Gupta & Co., Advocates & Consultants, as his Advocate. Even therein, by specific name, no individual Advocate with enrollment number, has been appointed by the appellant.

Delhi Bar Council Rules mandate that no partnership concern can be appointed as Counsel / Advocate by any party.

Accordingly, aforesaid Vakalatnama is deficient.

Ms. Suhani, Advocate is not appointed by appellant as Counsel as to what she claims orally in her submissions in video conferencing herein.

Now Ms. Suhani, Advocate submits that her name be taken on record as proxy Counsel for Sh. Shalabh Gupta, Advocate.

How is the present appeal maintainable in the present form ?

Contd./-...

CNR No.DLST01-002911-2026
RCT ARCT No.3/2026
Om Prakash Vs. Vinod Choudhary

// 2 //

Brief written submissions on above facet, not exceeding three pages be filed by the appellant.

Let appellant appear in person on the next date of hearing.

Put up on 10.04.2026 for consideration.

(Gurvinder Pal Singh)
Rent Control Tribunal /
Principal District & Sessions Judge (South)
Saket Courts, New Delhi (*ab*)