

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

Pushkar Singh

Vs

Ansuiya

Civil Appeal No. 3582 of 2006

(Ashok Bhan and Markandeya Katju, JJ)

22.08.2006

JUDGMENT

MARKANDEY KATJU, J.

1. Leave Granted.

2. This appeal has been filed against the impugned judgment and order of the learned Single Judge of the Delhi High Court dated 7-7-2003 by which the Civil Miscellaneous (Main) Petition No. 151 of 2002 of the respondent was allowed and the order of the Additional Rent Controller dated 19th October, 2001 directing eviction of the tenant from the premises bearing flat No. 215-A, Type-B, Ground Floor, opposite GTB Hospital, Nand Nagari, Delhi under Section 14 (1) (e) of the Act was set aside.

3. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

4. The appellant filed a petition under Section 14 (1) (e) of the Delhi Rent Control Act against his tenant Ansuiya, the respondent herein. The flat in question comprises of two rooms, bathroom, kitchen, latrine and Courtyard which the appellant had let out to the respondent in the year 1990.

5. In his petition under Sec. 14 (1) (e) read with Section 25-B of the Delhi Rent Control Act, the appellant contended that his family comprises of himself, his wife, two sons, three daughters who are dependent upon him for the purposes of residence. He further stated that his elder son got married on 21-7-1998 and that he required one room for himself and his wife, one room for his son and his family, one drawing room and one study room, one worship room and one guest room. The appellant further stated that his daughter Archana is employed and his second daughter completed BAMS and the third daughter is a student of B.Sc and that his married son and daughter-in-law are doing graduation and the younger son is a student of Physiotherapy. He further stated that the accommodation presently available with him is not sufficient for the purposes of residence and as such he requires the flat in question, under the tenancy of the respondent bonafide for the purpose of residence. The appellant also stated that the flat in question was let out to the respondent for the purpose of residence. In the light of these submissions, the appellant filed the petition and prayed that an eviction order be passed in his favour and against the respondent, under Section 14 (1) (e) the Delhi Rent Control Act.

6. In her written statement, the respondent stated that the appellant had an alternative accommodation bearing No. 6/213. at Harijan Basti, Delhi consisting of nine rooms which is in the name of his wife Smt. Krishna Devi. Thus, it was alleged that the appellant has sufficient accommodation.

7. The learned Additional Rent Controller, Karkardooma, Delhi by the order dated 19-10-2001. allowed the petition holding that there is bonafide need of the appellant and his family members. The said authority held that the appellant cannot be compelled to occupy the property of his wife.

8. Aggrieved, the tenant/respondent filed a petition under Article 227 of the Constitution which was treated as a Revision Petition under Section 25-B (8) of the Delhi Rent Control Act and that Revision was allowed by the High Court by the impugned order. The High Court held that an alternative residential accommodation cannot be ignored if it is owned by the wife when both husband and wife are cohabiting together and are joint in mess and living. The High Court held that since there is residential accommodation in Harijan Basti in the name of the appellant's wife, hence it cannot be said that the landlord needs is bonafide.

9. Aggrieved against the impugned order, this appeal has been filed before this Court.

10. In this Court, the learned counsel for the appellant landlord stated that the alternative accommodation at Harijan Basti in the name of the appellant's wife is wholly unsuitable and the appellant needs the flat in question for the bona fide requirement of himself and family and that the appellant is prepared to offer the premises at Harijan Basti which is in his wife's name on tenancy to the respondent tenant if the respondent was willing to occupy the same. However, learned counsel for the respondent stated that the respondent was unwilling to accept the offer of the alternative accommodation at Harijan Basti which was in the name of the appellant's wife. In these circumstances, we are of the opinion that since the tenant herself believes that the accommodation at Harijan Basti is not suitable for residence, the petition cannot be rejected only on the ground that there is accommodation in the name of his wife at Harijan Basti.

11. A similar view was taken by this Court in M.L. Prabhakar v. Rajiv Singal 61

12. For the reasons given above, this appeal is allowed. The impugned judgment and order of the learned Single Judge of the Delhi High Court is set aside and the order of eviction of the learned Additional Rent Controller dt. 19-10-2001 is restored.

13. The Additional Rent Controller by his order dated 19-10-2001 had granted six months' time the date of that order to the tenant to vacate the premises in question. Since that six months' time has along since expired, we grant the tenant two months' time and his family members shall be time from the date of this order to vacate evicted by police force. the premises in question, failing which the

14. There shall be no order as to costs

J