



\$~36, 37, 40, 41

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

+ W.P.(C) 1495/2019

DINESH KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Bhupesh Narula and Mr Rinku
Narula, Advocates.

versus

SMT. VIDYA DEVI AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Anoop Praksh Awasthi, Adv. for
R 1 and 2.
Ms Saumya Tandon, Advocate for R-
4.

37

+ W.P.(C) 1496/2019

DINESH KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Bhupesh Narula and Mr Rinku
Narula, Advocates.

versus

SMT. VIDYA DEVI AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Anoop Praksh Awasthi, Adv. for
R 1 and 2.
Ms Saumya Tandon, Advocate for R-
4.

40

+ W.P.(C) 1529/2019

SH. SUDHIR KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Harshit Sharma, Advocate
alongwith petitioner in person.



versus

SMT. VIDYA DEVI AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Anoop Praksh Awasthi, Adv. for
R 1 and 2.
Ms Saumya Tandon, Advocate for R-
4.

41

+ W.P.(C) 1531/2019

SH. SUDHIR KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Harshit Sharma, Advocate
alongwith petitioner in person.

versus

SMT. VIDYA DEVI AND ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Anoop Praksh Awasthi, Adv. for
R 1 and 2.
Ms Saumya Tandon, Advocate for R-
4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU

ORDER

%

15.02.2019

Caveat No.144/2019 in WP(C) No.1496/2019

1. The caveator has put in appearance through counsel.
2. The caveat stands discharged.

W.P.(C) 1495/2019 & CM APPL. Nos.6923-24/2019

W.P.(C) 1496/2019 & CM APPL. Nos.6935/6936/2019

W.P.(C) 1529/2019 & CM APPL. Nos.7074-75/2019



W.P.(C) 1531/2019 & CM APPL. Nos.7085-86/2019

3. Issue notice.
4. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents accepts notice.
5. The petitioners have filed the present petitions impugning the orders dated 15.01.2019, whereby the petitioners have been directed to hand over vacant possession of certain properties: (i) property in Khasra no. 43/16/2 and 43/17/1 admeasuring 1 Bigha 18 Biswa situated at Village Mundka; (ii) plots measuring 1200 Sq. yards and 525 Sq yards in Khasra no. 28/5; and (iii) portion of A-1/241 Paschim Vihar New Delhi in possession of the said petitioners and their family members.
6. This Court is not inclined to pass an ad interim order, as it is pointed out that the petitioners are persons of means. It is stated by the petitioners that the property admeasuring 525 Sq yards in Khasra no. 28/5 is vacant and the land measuring 1200 Sq. yards is used for storage.
7. The learned counsel appearing for the respondent no. 2 (father of the petitioners) submits that the petitioners also have alternate residential properties in the same area. However, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners states that the same was sold to the father-in-law of Dinesh Kumar (petitioner in W.P (C) nos. 1495/2019 and 1496/2019). Be that as it may, the petitioners are all persons of means who can afford alternate accommodation. Further, there is a clear finding of ill treatment of the senior citizens (parents of the petitioners – respondent no. 2 and his wife). Further, this Court is informed that criminal complaints have also been filed and it would not be apposite to restrain eviction of the petitioners from the residential premises.



8. This Court is of the view that the parties should endeavour to resolve their disputes amicably. Accordingly, the parties are referred to the Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre (DHCMCC) to resolve their disputes amicably. The parties shall appear before the DHCMCC on 19.02.2019 at 3:30 pm.

6. List on 20.05.2019.

VIBHU BAKHRU, J

FEBRUARY 15, 2019
DR