



\$~15 to 18

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

RFA 580/2023, CM APPL. 37458/2023 & CM APPL. 37459/2023
PANCHSHEEL MARKETING PVT LTDAppellant

Through: Mr. Raghav Malhotra and Mr. Aadhar
Nautiyal, Advs.

versus

STATE BANK OF BIKANER AND
JAIPUR (NOW SBI) & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Jai Mohan and Mr. Aayush
Gupta, Advs. for SBI.
Mr. Alok Bhachawat, Mr. Sumeet
Singh and Mr. Ishan Jain, Advocates
for R-2.

16

RFA 589/2023, CM APPL. 38078/2023 & CM APPL. 38079/2023

PANCHSHEEL MARKETING PVT. LTD.Appellant

Through: Mr. Raghav Malhotra and Mr. Aadhar
Nautiyal, Advs.

versus

VISHWA AHIMSA SANGH & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Alok Bhachawat, Mr. Sumeet
Singh and Mr. Ishan Jain, Advocates
for R-1.
Mr. Jai Mohan and Mr. Aayush
Gupta, Advs. for SBI / R-2.

17

RFA 630/2023, CM APPL. 40596/2023, 40598/2023 & 60335/2023

STATE BANK OF INDIAAppellant

Through: Mr. Jai Mohan and Mr. Aayush
Gupta, Advs.

versus

VISHWA AHIMSA SANGH & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Alok Bhachawat, Mr. Sumeet



Singh and Mr. Ishan Jain, Advocates
for R-1.

18

+ RFA 777/2023, CM APPL. 19900/2025

VISHWA AHIMSA SANGH

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Alok Bhachawat, Mr. Sumeet
Singh and Mr. Ishan Jain, Advocates.

versus

PANCHSHEEL MARKETING PVT LTD & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Jai Mohan and Mr. Aayush
Gupta, Advs. for SBI / R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

%

16.03.2026

CM APPL. 47595/2024 in RFA 777/2023

1. Application under Section 151 of CPC has been filed on behalf of the Appellant / Vishwa Ahimsa Sangh seeking permission to let out the subject premises on rent to third party.
2. It is submitted that admittedly, Appellant is the landlord of subject property, in which State Bank of India had been a tenant. Possession has already been handed over to the Appellant, but because of *status quo* Order, Appellant has not been able to let out the Suit Property, which is causing loss to him. Prayer is therefore, made that he may be permitted to let out the Suit Property.
3. Learned counsel for the Respondents has contested the Application on the ground that there is no dispute that they were tenant in the Suit premises, but Respondent No.1 had erected the entire super structure and thereafter, sub-let the premises to State Bank of India, who had been in occupation for



about 25 years. Consequently, Respondent No.1 has vested interest. Prayer for letting out the property is therefore, opposed.

Submissions heard and record perused.

4. Admittedly, there was a landlord-tenant relationship between the Appellant and Respondents and the possession has already been handed over to the Appellant.

5. The only challenge by the Respondents is that they have spent substantial amount on the construction of super structure and also that they are entitled to the rent, but that entails the recovery and cannot be treated as vested right in the Suit Property.

6. In view of aforesaid, *status quo* Order dated 20.09.2023 is modified and the Appellant is at liberty to rent out the Suit premises to third party, as prayed.

RFA 580/2023, CM APPL. 37458/2023 & CM APPL. 37459/2023;

RFA 589/2023, CM APPL. 38078/2023 & CM APPL. 38079/2023;

RFA 630/2023, CM APPL. 40596/2023, 40598/2023 & 60335/2023; and

RFA 777/2023, CM APPL. 19900/2025

7. E-TCR be summoned before the next date of hearing.

8. Written submissions be filed by the parties within eight weeks with copy to each other, failing which, the same shall be accepted subject to deposit of cost of Rs.25,000/- with the Delhi High Court Advocates' Welfare Trust.

9. List for arguments on 15.10.2026.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J.

MARCH 16, 2026/R