

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE R.SUBHASH REDDY

CIVIL REVISION PETITION No.3260 of 2015

ORDER :

This Civil Revision Petition, under Section 22 of the A.P. Buildings (Lease, Rent and Eviction) Control Act, 1960 (for brevity "the Act") is filed by the petitioner herein aggrieved by the order dated 31.07.2015, in I.A.No.99 of 2015 in R.C.No.73 of 2014, passed by the Principal Rent Controller, City Small Causes Court, Secunderabad, allowing the application filed by the respondents herein, under Order 22 Rule 3, and under Rule 19 of Rent Control Rules, seeking to come on record as the legal heirs of the deceased-petitioner in R.C./1st respondent herein.

2. Originally, the sole 1st respondent herein has filed R.C.No.73 of 2014 under the Act, claiming eviction of the petitioner/tenant for bonafide requirement and also to commence business in the petition schedule premises. After his demise, respondent Nos.2 to 5 herein, who are the legal representatives of the deceased-1st respondent herein, have filed the present application, being I.A.No.99 of 2015, seeking to come on record as the legal heirs of the deceased-petitioner/1st respondent herein. The Court below, after considering the material on record, has

allowed the said application through the impugned order dated 31.7.2015. Hence, the present civil revision petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner/tenant contends that as the R.C. is filed only on the ground of personal requirement of the deceased-1st respondent herein, after his demise, this application being I.A.No.99 of 2015 seeking to come on record as the legal heirs of the deceased-1st respondent, is not maintainable.

4. The said contention of the learned counsel cannot be countenanced, for the reason that all the proposed petitioners/respondent Nos.2 to 5 herein seek to come on record as the legal representatives of the deceased-1st respondent herein. No prejudice will be caused to the petitioner/tenant if the proposed petitioners/respondent Nos.2 to 5 herein come on record.

5. In view of the reasons assigned by the Court below, I do not find any illegality in the impugned order passed by the Court below, so as to interfere with the same.

6. This civil revision petition is devoid of merits and is accordingly dismissed, at the admission stage. As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed. No order as to costs.

JUSTICE R. SUBHASH

REDDY

14.08.2015.

Msr

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE R.SUBHASH REDDY

-

CIVIL REVISION PETITION No.3260 of 2015

14.08.2015
Msr