



2025:DHC:5543



\$~76

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

% **Date of Decision: 11th July, 2025**

+ W.P.(C) 9675/2025 & CM APPL. 40627/2025, CM APPL.
40628/2025

RAHUL VERMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anshuman, Mr. Rohan Mandal,
Mr. Mohit, Mr. Piyush Ahluwalia,
Advocates
(M:9818571429)
Email:advocateanshuman1458@gmail.com

versus

DELHI CANTONMENT BOARD

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Tarveen Singh Nanda, Mr. Ankur
Mishra, Advocates
(M:9899703768)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

MINI PUSHKARNA, J (ORAL):

1. The present writ petition has been filed for quashing the impugned Notice dated 10th June, 2025, issued by the respondent, i.e., Delhi Cantonment Board, to the petitioner.
2. There is a further prayer for directions to respondent to consider the representation dated 18th June, 2025 of the petitioner, by giving personal hearing to the petitioner, whereby, the petitioner has expressed his willingness for the renewal or execution of fresh lease, on mutually



2025:DHC:5543



agreeable terms.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the lawful occupier of the shop bearing no. *S-2, admeasuring 14.70 sq. meters situated at Kalpatru Commercial Complex, Survey No. 49/13, Sadar Bazar, Delhi Cantt.*

4. It is submitted that originally, Dr. Jaspal Singh entered into a Lease Agreement dated 13th July, 1995, with the respondent-Delhi Cantonment Board, through which leasehold rights in respect of the said unit were granted to him for an initial period of ten years, with an option for renewing, available to the lessee for a total period of upto thirty years.

5. Subsequently, Dr. Jaspal Singh, transferred the leasehold right to one Shri Navender Singh Walia *vide* Sale Agreement dated 22nd October, 1998, who transferred his leasehold right to the petitioner herein, by virtue of the Sale Agreement dated 29th March, 2012.

6. It is submitted that the petitioner is aggrieved by the Notice dated 10th June, 2025, issued by the respondent, whereby, a demand of Rs. 12,97,996/- has been raised towards alleged outstanding rent in respect of said unit.

7. It is further submitted that the said Notice directs the petitioner to vacate and handover possession of the premises by 12th July, 2025, on the ground that the aggregate period of thirty years of the lease, expires on the said date.

8. It is submitted that in terms of Clause 4 of the lease deed, there was no obligation to pay rent, as an amount of Rs. 2,76,000/- was deposited by the lessee, in view thereof. It is further submitted that the original lease deed dated 13th July, 1995, between respondent-Delhi Cantonment Board and Dr.



2025:DHC:5543



Jaspal Singh, does not contain any provision for charging interest on unpaid rent. Thus, it is submitted that any interest amount included in the outstanding dues, is without any contractual or legal basis, hence, the same is not payable.

9. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no previous notice has been received by the petitioner for payment of any rent/lease amount, except the Notice dated 10th June, 2025. Thus, the present writ petition has been filed.

10. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondent-Delhi Cantonment Board, on advance notice, submits that the petitioner herein is a stranger, and the respondent does not recognize the petitioner.

11. He submits that the respondent had entered into a Lease Agreement with Dr. Jaspal Singh and that respondent is not aware of any arrangement, which the petitioner has with Dr. Jaspal Singh, or anyone else.

12. He further draws the attention of this Court to the Lease Deed dated 13th July, 1995 between the respondent and Dr. Jaspal Singh, and in particular, relies upon Clause 2 and 3.

13. By referring upon the aforesaid terms of the Lease Agreement, learned counsel for the respondent submits that the terms of the Lease Agreement cannot be beyond thirty years. Thus, he submits that since the period of Lease Agreement is expiring on 12th July, 2025, the petitioner is bound to vacate the unit in question.

14. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has given a representation dated 18th June, 2025, wherein, the petitioner has given his willingness to renew the lease on fresh terms.



2025:DHC:5543



15. However, the said submission is vehemently opposed by learned counsel for the respondent on the ground that the petitioner has not been recognized by the respondent and thereby is not entitled to any renewal.

16. He further submits that all the notices issued by the respondent have only been issued to Dr. Jaspal Singh, and not to the petitioner.

17. Having heard learned counsels for the parties, this Court notes the terms of the Lease Agreement dated 13th July, 1995, wherein, it is categorically stated that the total period of lease will not exceed thirty years.

The relevant Clauses from the Lease Agreement, read as under:

“xxx xxx xxx

2. That the said commercial unit will be leased initially for a period of ten years extendable by a further period of ten years at the option of the lessee and for a still further period of ten years at the option of both the Board and the lessee. In no case, the total period of lease will exceed thirty yrs.

*3. For extension of lease beyond twenty years, the consent of both the Board and the lessee would be necessary. In case both the parties agree, they may agree to extend the lease for a period not exceeding ten years on such terms & conditions and such rent as may be worked out mutually between them. As stated earlier, **the aggregate period of lease will not exceed thirty years.***

xxx xxx xxx”

(Emphasis Supplied)

18. Thus, no directions can be made by this Court for continuation of the petitioner in the premises in question, beyond the terms of lease deed. However, it is directed that the petitioner shall not be evicted from the premises in question, without following the due procedure and process of law.



2025:DHC:5543



19. It is to be noted that in a similar matter, i.e., *W.P.(C) 9688/2025*, titled as “*Davinder Singh Versus Delhi Cantonment Board*”, this Court has already directed that the representation of the petitioner therein, be considered by the respondent, as per its policy.
20. Therefore, in parity with the said order passed in *W.P.(C) 9688/2025*, this Court directs that the representation of the petitioner dated 18th June, 2025, be considered by the respondent, as per its policy.
21. It is further directed that upon the expiry of the Lease Agreement of the petitioner, any action that shall be taken by the respondent for getting the premises vacated, shall be taken expeditiously, in accordance with law, after following the due procedure.
22. It is clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion either on the right or locus of the petitioner or on the merits of the case of the petitioner.
23. It is further clarified that merely because there are directions by this Court to consider the representation of the petitioner, the same shall not be an impediment with the respondent to issue any notice under the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorized Occupants) Act, 1971 (“PP Act”), after expiry of the lease of the petitioner.
24. Additionally, it is clarified that any proceedings to be initiated by the respondent under the PP Act, shall be independent/separate from the issue with respect to considering the representation of the petitioner.
25. Needless to state, rights and contentions of the parties are left open, to be adjudicated in appropriate proceedings.
26. With the aforesaid directions, the present writ petition, along with



2025:DHC:5543



pending applications, is disposed of.

JULY 11, 2025

au

MINI PUSHKARNA, J