

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

C.R. No.1505 of 2015

Date of Decision.03.03.2015

Raghu Raj Chatley @ Raghu Raj Chathley

.....Petitioner

Versus

Naresh Sood son of late Chint Ram

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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?

-. -

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. The counsel for the petitioner states that the defence by the tenant in both the cases where the action for eviction is sought by the landlord is that the rent note is forged and fabricated. The question for consideration in both the rent petitions by the landlord for eviction in respect of two different periods and for additional ground of personal necessity would be whether the plea of personal necessity is true or not.

2. The petition for consolidation of both the cases by a transfer from one Court to another is dismissed by the District Judge on the ground that the two cases are at different stages. The counsel for the petitioner points out that trial has not begun in both the cases. In a normal situation, I would have allowed a notice to be served on the other side and hear the opposite side before the order was reviewed but considering the fact that such a process would entail further delay and

having regard to the limited contention made that the trial in both the

cases have not been started yet, I think it appropriate that the order passed by the District Judge is set aside and the cases are directed to be taken together. The case before Mr. Prashant Verma, Rent Controller, Moga in R.T. No.3/14.08.2012 is directed to be withdrawn and transferred to the Court of Ms. Sanjeeta, Rent Controller, Moga to be taken up along side R.T. No.12-A-2 dated 13.08.2012/19.05.2010. The respondent is at liberty to approach this Court for any modification of this order if there is suppression of fact or error in particulars set out by the petitioner before me in securing this order.

3. The revision petition is disposed of with the above direction.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

March 03, 2015
Pankaj*