

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No.15132/1999

(From the judgement and order dated 12/08/1999 in CR 795/99  
of The HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT N. DELHI)

MOHAN LAL

Petitioner (s)

VERSUS

SURESH C. GUPTA & ORS

Respondent (s)

(With prayer for interim relief and Office Report)  
(For Final Disposal )

With

SLP(C)No.14380/2000  
(With prayer for interim relief)  
(For final disposal)

CONMT.PET.(Civil)No.342/2000 in SLP(C) No.15132/1999  
(For final disposal)

Date : 07/02/2002:These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.P. MOHAPATRA  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BRIJESH KUMAR

For Petitioner (s) Mr. K.R. Nagaraja,Adv. (N/P)  
Mr. Shaad Anwar, Adv.  
Mr. Naresh Kumar, Adv.

For Respondent (s) Mr. M.C. Dhingra,Adv.  
Mr. Chander Shekhar Ashri, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R@@  
AAAAAAAAA

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J.R  
.SP2

We have heard learned counsel for the parties.  
The tenant has filed these Special Leave Petitions  
assailing the orders passed by the Delhi High Court  
confirming the order of eviction passed against him. While

....2.

:2:

SLP(C) No. 15132/1999 arises from the Order of the High  
Court confirming the order of the court below allowing the

landlord's petition for eviction on the ground of bonafide requirement under Section 14(1)(e) of the Delhi Rent Control Act, SLP(C) No. 14380/2000 is directed against the Order of the High Court confirming the eviction order passed on the ground of availability of alternative residential accommodation with the tenant as provided under Section 14(1)(h) of the said Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed before us the relevant portions of the orders passed by the Additional Rent Controller, the Appellate Authority and the High Court in these matters. We are of the view that the questions that arise in the proceedings are whether leave to defend sought by the tenant under Section 25(B) (4) & (5) of the Act was rightly refused by the Additional Rent Controller; whether eviction order passed on the ground of bonafide requirement was valid and whether the tenant had acquired alternative residential accommodation for himself. We find that in the orders passed by the statutory authorities these questions were considered and cogent reasons were given for accepting the grounds of eviction pleaded by the landlord. The High Court, therefore, rightly confirmed the orders passed by the Appellate Authority. The SLPs being devoid of merit, are dismissed. No costs.

The contempt proceeding is dropped.

.SP1

Jatinder

(S.MALKANI)  
Court Master