

**THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CR No. 1493 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of decision: March 2, 2015

Arun Deep Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Smt. Sunita Sharma

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present: Mr. SK Tripathi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

1. There is simply no scope for intervention in a revision in a situation where the contention is that the petitioner was not served in the proceedings before the Rent Controller and the statement said to have been filed in court was not filed by him. According to him, the statement does not contain his signatures. If any order has been passed without service of summons and the statement filed in court is not supported by any vakalatnama given by the parties to any counsel and the person who has filed the written statement has filed the same without the signatures of the parties or without his instructions, all these matters would be issues for the petitioner to file an application to recall the order pointing out to these lapses. These lapses, of whether the petitioner had given instructions to the lawyer or not or whether he had signed the written statement or not cannot be re-opened in the stage of revision. The difficulty experienced by the

counsel is that when he informed the court that he had not instructed the counsel nor had he engaged him to file written statement but the Rent Controller has directed the petitioner to pay all arrears.

2. There can be no manner of information to a Judge other than an application. Oral submissions ought to have a basis for a petition before the court and I cannot countenance a plea that the petitioner made submission before a judge that he had not filed the written statement and the judge asked him to pay the past arrears. I will take all these submissions to be without any basis and castles in the air and discard the same being untenable.

3. The revision petition is dismissed.

March 2, 2015
prem

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE