



2025:DHC:7758



\$~87

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% ***Date of Decision: 04th September, 2025***

+ CM(M) 1724/2025 & CM APPL. 55959/2025

VIJAY KUMAR KABRA (DECEASED) THROUGH LR

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Kavya Jhavar, Advocate.

versus

SHEELA SINGH

.....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN****J U D G M E N T (oral)**

1. Petitioner is defending an eviction petition filed on the ground of *bona fide* requirement under Section 14 (1)(e) of *Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958*.
2. Such tenant filed an application seeking *leave to defend* and, thereafter, the landlord filed response thereto by filing his reply on 28.01.2025.
3. Undoubtedly, such filing of reply by the landlord was a belated one.
4. Fact remains that, thereafter, the learned Controller granted opportunity to the tenant to file rejoinder within four weeks.
5. It was not filed within four weeks and when the matter was, eventually, taken up by the learned Controller on 01.04.2025, there was request from the side of the tenant that the counsel was unwell.
6. The Controller acceded to the request made by the tenant and granted them another period of two weeks to file rejoinder.
7. It seems that such concession given by the learned Controller was not taken by the tenant seriously enough and when the matter was taken up by the



2025:DHC:7758



learned Controller on 09.07.2025, there was another request coming from their side contending that the tenant was unable to contact his counsel.

8. Keeping in mind the sufficient opportunities already granted to tenant for filing rejoinder, the learned Controller closed their right to file rejoinder while also observing that the filing of rejoinder was not a “*matter of right*” and it was only subject to the permission granted by the Court.

9. This Court is conscious and mindful of the fact that the landlord has filed a petition seeking eviction on the ground of *bona fide requirement* and the procedure prescribed for disposal of such petition is a *summary one* which needs to be fast-tracked.

10. Despite grant of sufficient opportunities, the tenant did not bother to file rejoinder within the given time-frame and, therefore, finding no illegality or perversity in the impugned order, the present petition is dismissed.

11. The pending application also stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

SEPTEMBER 4, 2025/ss/shs