



\$~49

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

+ **RC.REV. 195/2025**

SARDHA RAM HARI RAM

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sthavi Asthana, Advocate.
versus

BIMLA DEVI

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Usha Singh and Mr. Shahrukh
Inam, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

%

21.05.2026

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

CM APPL. 34783/2026 (Extension of time for vacating demised Premises)

2. The present application under Section 151 of the CPC seeks the following prayers:

“a. Allow the present application and grant extension to vacate the demised premises by 31.12.2027; and

b. Pass any other order as this Hon’ble Court may deem fit in the interest of justice.”

3. *Vide* order 15.07.2025, the captioned petition was disposed of by the learned Predecessor Bench of this Court by taking on record an affidavit of undertaking by the applicant/petitioner, that he shall surrender vacant, peaceful and physical possession of the subject premises to the respondent or his nominee on or before 31.03.2026.



4. Subsequently, an application, CM APPL. 20025/2026 seeking further extension of 90 (*ninety*) days was preferred by the applicant/petitioner and *vide* order dated 30.03.2026, this Court had passed the following order: -

“5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, on instructions, submits that the latter shall vacate the premises within a period of 60 days and shall also pay an extra sum of Rs. 25,000/- per month in addition to Rs. 60,000/- per month for his stay beyond the period of time as mentioned in the undertaking.

6. In these circumstances, the petitioner shall vacate the premises on or before 01.06.2026 and shall pay a sum of Rs. 85,000/- per month to the respondent alongwith statutory charges, including electricity and water.

7. Petitioner shall place on record fresh affidavit of undertaking before the next date of hearing.”

5. The present application seeks further extension of time. It is a matter of record that the applicant/petitioner has already been given sufficient time to vacate the subject premises. The present application is again filed on similar grounds that the applicant/petitioner is not able to find an alternate accommodation. The impugned order dated 17.01.2025 was passed by the learned ARC on the basis of eviction petition preferred on behalf of the respondent for *bona fide* requirement for running his business.

6. In these circumstances, further extension of time, if given to the applicant/petitioner, will further deprive the respondent/landlord of the subject premises, for which he had filed the eviction petition and was successful in obtaining an eviction order. In view of the same, the application is dismissed and disposed of.

7. Needless to state that the applicant/petitioner shall abide by his affidavit



of undertaking dated 02.05.2026, filed in pursuance of order dated 30.03.2026 passed by this Court.

8. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court, *forthwith*.

AMIT SHARMA, J

MAY 21, 2026/bsr/db