



\$~25

\*

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

+

**RC.REV. 506/2012 & CM Appls.17482/2012, 7212/2018, 18830/2018**

**TEJENDER SINGH**

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Mana Singh, Adv.

versus

**USHA RANI & ANR**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Raghu Vasishth, Adv. for LR of R-1.

Mr. L.C. Rajput, Adv. for R-2.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE TARA VITASTA GANJU**

**ORDER**

%

**10.12.2024**

1. The son of the Petitioner and Respondent No.2 is present in the Court today. Learned Counsel for LR of Respondent No.1 submits that Respondent No.1 has expired.

2. This Court had on 12.11.2024 had recorded the following:

*“5. It is apparent that the delay in proceedings is being caused on account of impleadment of the legal heirs of the Respondents.*

*6. It is settled law that a co-owner contests on behalf of each of the co-owners and unless there is objection raised on any of the co-owners.”*

3. Learned Counsel for the Respondent No.2 submits that the Impugned Order was passed on 10.07.2012 by the learned Trial Court dismissing the leave to defend Application filed by the Petitioner. He further submits that the issue of landlord-tenant relationship is not disputed, neither is there any alternate suitable accommodation available with the Respondents.

3.1 The only contention raised by the Petitioner was on the aspect of *bona fide* need. The Impugned Order has also dealt with this contention.

4. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner requests for an accommodation.



5. Given the fact that the matter is more than 12 years old, in the interest of justice, list on 17.12.2024.
6. It is clarified that no further adjournment will be granted to the Petitioner.
7. Parties shall remain present before the Court on the next date of hearing.
8. Parties shall act based on the digitally signed copy of the order.

**TARA VITASTA GANJU, J**

**DECEMBER 10, 2024/r**

*Click here to check corrigendum, if any*