



\$~51

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

% ***Date of Decision: 21th March, 2025***

+ CM(M) 528/2025 & CM APPL. 16595-16596/2025

SHAKTI KUMAR PAWAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajeev Gupta, Advocate.

versus

SMT SHASHI GOSAIN

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Pranshu Gosain, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Mr. Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner/tenant, does not dispute the fact that there is a relationship of landlord and tenant between the parties, and the rate of the rent as claimed by the landlord is also not disputed, though according to him, these are user charges. After hearing arguments for some time, he submits that the petitioner, who is defending suit for possession in question, may, at least, be permitted to take an objection with respect to valuation. He, thus, does not pray for any further relief.

2. Learned counsel for respondent/plaintiff, who appears on advance notice, submits that the intention of the defendant is to, somehow, delay the matter on one pretext or the other. He, however, submits that without prejudice to his rights and contentions, he would have no objection, if any such application is moved by defendant, limiting his request for amendment



so far as it relates to valuation aspect.

3. The present petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.
4. Let application, if any, be filed by defendant within one week from today. If any such application is moved, learned Trial Court shall consider the same in accordance with law, after giving due opportunity of hearing to both the sides.
5. Learned counsel for plaintiff submits that his one application moved under Order XXXIX Rule 10 CPC is pending adjudication. Learned Trial Court is also requested to consider the abovesaid application, as expeditiously as possible, as the arrears are allegedly due from June, 2022.
6. The present petition, along with pending applications, stands disposed of.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

MARCH 21, 2025/sw/pb