



\$~18

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

+ RC.REV. 94/2026 & CM APPL. 19541/2026 (Stay)

VIDYA DEVI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. J.K. Chawla, Advocate
through Video Conferencing.

versus

PAWAN KUMAR CHAUHAN & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Vineet Sharma, Advocate
through Video Conferencing.

CORAM:

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN
SHANKAR**

ORDER

14.07.2026

%

1. In view of the fact that the lawyers are abstaining from work today, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties were specifically queried as to whether they were willing to have the matter taken up for hearing. Upon learned counsel for the parties expressing their consent thereto, the present matter was taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing.

2. Mr. J.K. Chawla, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner, submits that the Judgement dated 12.09.2025 [**“Impugned Judgement”**], whereby the Petitioner’s Application seeking leave to defend was dismissed, is vitiated on account of the learned Additional Rent Controller [**“learned ARC”**] having failed to consider the specific plea of the Petitioner that the requirement of the tenanted premises for expansion of the landlord’s existing business, by itself, gave rise to a triable issue. He submits that, since the aforesaid plea



has not been considered by the learned ARC, the Impugned Judgement warrants interference by this Court.

3. Learned counsel for the Petitioner further submits that the plea as to whether the tenanted premises were *bona fide* required for the sons of the landlord to carry on their respective businesses also gave rise to a triable issue, which has similarly not been considered or adjudicated by the learned ARC.

4. In support of the aforesaid submissions, learned counsel for the Petitioner, places reliance upon various Judgements of this Court. He has also filed a compilation of ten Judgements, which, according to him, support the proposition that the aforesaid pleas give rise to triable issues and, consequently, the Application seeking leave to defend could not have been rejected.

5. Learned counsel for the Petitioner further submits that the Written Submissions, filed on behalf of the Petitioner, are already on record and requests that the same be considered while rendering the Judgement.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

7. Arguments heard.

8. Judgement reserved.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J

JULY 14, 2026/nd/dj