



REAL ESTATE

Housewife-Landlady's Right to Seek Eviction for Husband's Welfare: Delhi High Court Upholds Bona-Fide Requirement under Section 14(1)(e) of the Delhi Rent Control Act

AUTHOR Suresh Palav, Divy Lotia

PUBLISHED 24 October 2025

Introduction

In a significant pronouncement reaffirming the gender-neutral application of rent control law, the Delhi High Court in *Naveen Kumar v. Babita Jain*^[1] examined the contours of bona-fide requirement under Section 14(1)(e) of the Delhi Rent Control Act, 1958 (“the DRC Act”). The Court held that a housewife who owns a tenanted property can legitimately seek eviction of the tenant if the premises are required for her husband’s welfare or for enabling him to start a business. The decision reiterates that familial obligations and spousal dependence fall squarely within the expression “for his own use” as employed under Section 14(1)(e).

The ruling thus clarifies an important facet of rent control jurisprudence, that gender or occupation of the landlord cannot be used to question the genuineness of a claim, and that a landlady’s position as a housewife does not disqualify her from asserting a bona-fide need for her spouse’s sustenance and dignity.

Factual Background

The dispute concerned Shop No. 6, Ground Floor, Property No. 43, Gandhi Gali, Fatehpuri, Delhi. The respondent, Mrs. Babita Jain, filed an eviction petition under Section 14(1)(e) of the DRC Act seeking possession of the tenanted shop from the petitioner, Naveen Kumar. The landlady contended that her husband wished to start a dry-fruits business and required the said premises for this purpose. The learned Additional Rent Controller (Central District, T is Hazari Courts) allowed the eviction petition by order dated 7 January 2023, having found the requirement to be genuine and the absence of any other suitable accommodation.

Aggrieved, the tenant approached the Delhi High Court in revision under Section 25-B (8) of the DRC Act, challenging the correctness of the ARC’s order. The primary ground of challenge was that the landlady, being a housewife, could not claim an eviction for the benefit of her husband, and that the alleged need was fabricated.

Arguments of the Parties

Tenant’s Contentions

The tenant, represented by learned counsel Ms. Mala Goel, contended that the landlady’s plea of bona-fide requirement was false and not supported by any material evidence. It was argued that the landlady had sold other properties prior to filing the eviction petition and had also concealed material facts in the site plan. Furthermore, the tenant claimed that the landlady’s husband was already assisting his son in an existing dry-fruits business and therefore did not require another shop. The tenant also asserted that being a housewife, the landlady could not realistically claim that her husband was dependent on her, especially when she herself had no independent source of income.

Landlady’s Defence

The landlady, represented by Mr. Arun Birbal and Mr. Sonjay Singh, opposed the revision petition, arguing that her husband was aged and required to be supported through a business venture that could sustain him financially. It was submitted that the landlady’s status as a housewife had no bearing on her right to seek eviction under Section 14(1)(e), and that the welfare of her husband and family fell within the ambit of “own use.” The counsel emphasised that the tenant had failed to produce any cogent evidence to disprove the claimed requirement or to show that the husband was employed elsewhere.

Issues Before the Court

The central issue before the High Court was whether a housewife-landlady could seek eviction of a tenant under Section 14(1)(e) of the DRC Act for premises required for her husband’s welfare and livelihood, and whether such a claim could be considered a bona-fide requirement within the meaning of the statute.

Court’s Analysis

Scope of “For His Own Use”

The Court began by analysing the statutory phrase “for his own use” appearing in Section 14(1)(e). The Court referred to the seminal judgment of the Supreme Court in *Joginder Pal v. Naval Kishore Behal*^[2], where it was held that the expression must receive a liberal interpretation to include members of the landlord’s family who are dependent on him or closely connected with

him. The Court reiterated that the requirement of a spouse or family member is an extension of the landlord's own requirement and cannot be artificially restricted by rigid literal interpretation.

Applicability to a Housewife-Landlady

Rejecting the tenant's argument that a housewife could not have such a requirement, the Court observed that gender or occupation is immaterial in determining bona-fide need. It was held that a housewife has equal rights as any other property owner to seek eviction if the premises are required for the welfare or livelihood of her dependents. The Court emphasised that interpreting the statute otherwise would amount to indirect discrimination, contrary to Articles 14 and 15 of the Constitution of India. The welfare of a husband or family member is integrally connected with the landlady's own welfare, and therefore, the claim falls squarely within "for her own use."

Reaffirmation of Bona-Fide Requirement Standards

Referring to *Shiv Sarup Gupta v. Dr. Mahesh Chand Gupta*^[3], the Court restated that the concept of bona-fide requirement means an honest, genuine, and sincere need, as opposed to a fanciful or whimsical desire. Once a landlord establishes such sincerity, the burden shifts to the tenant to demonstrate that the claim is mala fide or pretextual. In the present case, the tenant failed to produce any material evidence to show that the husband was gainfully employed elsewhere or that the landlady possessed other suitable premises.

Evaluation of Tenant's Allegations

The Court noted that the tenant's allegations regarding concealment of other properties and inaccuracies in the site plan had already been considered by the ARC and found to be unsubstantiated. The High Court found no reason to reappraise these factual findings, especially since the tenant had not produced documentary proof to establish any concealment. The Court further observed that the husband's age and dependence on his wife were undisputed, thereby lending credence to the landlady's claim.

Findings and Directions

The Court upheld the ARC's finding that the landlady's need for the premises for her husband's business was genuine and bona fide. It reaffirmed that familial obligations and the desire to provide livelihood to a dependent spouse are legitimate grounds for eviction under Section 14(1)(e). The Court, therefore, dismissed the tenant's revision petition as being devoid of merit.

During the proceedings, the tenant's counsel, on instructions from the tenant's family members present in Court, submitted that the tenant was willing to vacate the premises. The Court recorded this undertaking, directing that the tenant shall hand over peaceful and vacant possession of the premises to the landlady on or before 30 May 2026, after clearing all electricity, water, and statutory dues. The tenant was further directed to continue paying user and occupation charges as fixed by the Court's earlier order dated 3 July 2023. The tenant was also required to file an affidavit of undertaking within two weeks.

Conclusion and Author's Opinion

This judgment marks an important reaffirmation of equality and family-centric interpretation within tenancy law. By recognising a housewife's right to seek eviction for her husband's welfare, the Delhi High Court has harmonised the DRC Act with the constitutional principles of gender neutrality and human dignity. The Court's reasoning rightly reflects that ownership and legal rights are not dependent on economic participation or employment status.

From a policy standpoint, the decision promotes fairness by ensuring that legitimate family needs are not defeated by outdated gendered assumptions. The Court's reliance on *Joginder Pal* and *Shiv Sarup Gupta* demonstrates continuity in legal reasoning, while its contextual application to a modern household setup highlights judicial sensitivity to evolving family roles.

In the author's opinion, the decision strengthens the jurisprudence surrounding Section 14(1)(e) and sends a strong message that familial welfare and economic dignity are central to the concept of bona-fide requirement. It bridges the gap between domestic responsibility and legal entitlement, reinforcing the idea that a woman's right to property and its lawful use extends equally to protecting and supporting her spouse.

For more details, write to us at: contact@indialaw.in

^[1] RC.REV.168/2023

^[2] (2002) 5 SCC 397

Related Practice Areas

Real Estate