

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

C.R. No.3039 of 2015

Date of Decision.06.05.2015

Baldev Singh Boparai

.....Petitioner

Versus

Gurinderjit Kaur and another

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. C.B. Goel, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Divanshu Jain, Advocate
for the caveator-respondents.

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. There is no case other than the time sought by the tenant to vacate the premises. The extension of time for deposit which was rejected by this Court meant that there was no scope for the order of eviction to be challenged. The counsel stays that he has obtained an allotment from a public authority for another apartment and he will soon shift there but the property has not been made ready. Further he has to celebrate the marriage of his daughter and son.

2. The caveator is present through counsel and he has instructions to say that the Court might provide for time for six months. I provide for time for eight months. This is on condition that the petitioner pays to the landlord rent which is determined within five days of every calendar month. He will also give an undertaking that he will

vacate the premises within eight months from today i.e. before 31.01.2016. The undertaking shall be given before this Court within a week. In the case of failure to either giving undertaking or making the payment in the manner directed, the landlord will be at liberty to put the order of eviction passed already in execution immediately.

3. The civil revision is disposed of with the above directions.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

May 06, 2015
Pankaj*