



\$~4

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

+ RC.REV. 90/2024 & CM APPL. 19561/2024, 19563/2024

KHAIRATI LAL SINCE DEASED

THROUGH LRS AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ankur Mahindro, Mr. Ankush
Satija & Mr. Mohit Dagar, Advs.

versus

NIRMALA DEVI SINCE DECEASED

THROUGH LRS AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajnish Kumar Gaiind, Mr.
Hemant Kaushik, Mr. Himanshu
Gupta, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

22.04.2026

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. Learned counsel for the respondent submitted that the petitioner had challenged the title of the respondent in the proceedings before the learned ARC while relying upon a suit bearing no. 318/1990 titled as **Munshi Ram vs. Mangla Devi & Ors.**
3. It is the case of the petitioner that the respondent's predecessor in interest, *i.e.*, Nirmala Devi, had entered into an Agreement to Sell with the erstwhile owner of the subject property namely, Sh. Chinku Ram on 16.11.1990. It is an admitted case of the respondent that the said Chinku Ram had passed away on the said date (16.11.1990) itself. It is the case of the petitioner that in 1992, the said suit was disposed of on a statement made by the LRs of Chinku Ram saying that they would not dispossess the petitioner



from the suit premises, and thus, demonstrating that the respondent-Nirmala Devi (since deceased) was not the owner at the relevant time.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent, however, handed up in Court today summons showing that husband of late Shri Nirmala Devi namely, Shri Chottey Lal was shown as defendant No.2 in the said suit. The same is taken on record. A copy of the same has been handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner, who seeks time to take appropriate instructions in this regard.
5. Renotify for hearing on 17.09.2026.
6. Interim order to continue.

AMIT SHARMA, J

APRIL 22, 2026/nk/ns