



\$~11 to 14

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

RC.REV. 265/2023, CM APPL. 50995/2023

VINOD KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shamim Ahmad Khan and Mr.
Kashif Ahmad Khan, Advocates.

versus

DR. BAL KISHAN PATODIA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Arvind Chaudhary, Mr. Sachin
Chaudhary and Ms. Madhu Sharma,
Advocates.

12

+

RC.REV. 266/2023, CM APPL. 50998/2023

VINOD KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shamim Ahmad Khan and Mr.
Kashif Ahmad Khan, Advocates.

Versus

SUBHASH CHAND NARAND

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Arvind Chaudhary, Mr. Sachin
Chaudhary and Ms. Madhu Sharma,
Advocates.

13

RC.REV. 267/2023, CM APPL. 51005/2023

RAJESH KUMARI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Shamim Ahmad Khan and Mr.
Kashif Ahmad Khan, Advocates.

versus

VIVEK GOYAL

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Arvind Chaudhary, Mr. Sachin
Chaudhary and Ms. Madhu Sharma,
Advocates.

14

RC.REV. 270/2023, CM APPL. 51185/2023

RAJESH KUMARI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shamim Ahmad Khan and Mr.
Kashif Ahmad Khan, Advocates.



versus

ANIL KUMAR

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Arvind Chaudhary, Mr. Sachin Chaudhary and Ms. Madhu Sharma, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

% **20.12.2025**

1. Having heard learned counsel for the landlord, as also taking into consideration the findings rendered by the learned ARC in *paragraph 8* of the impugned order, wherein the learned ARC has held that “...*petitioner wants to re-construct the building after demolishing the same and thereafter wants to provide space for the business of his son. After demolition and re-construction of the building, the structure is bound to be changed entailing the space which shall not be as per the site plan filed by the petitioner in respect of the present description of the property and it will be a matter of trial whether even after re-construction, the petitioner will need the same space without disturbing the occupation of the tenanted premises...*”, which, this Court is *prima facie* not agreeable with. As such, considering the nature of the dispute involved as also when the proceedings are still going on before the learned ARC during the pendency of the present revision petitions, the proceedings before the learned ARC are stayed till the next date of hearing.
2. Renotify on 24.03.2026.
3. A copy of this order be kept in all the connected matters.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J.

DECEMBER 20, 2025/NA