

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

C.R. No.3700 of 2015

Date of Decision.28.05.2015

Waheguru Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Om Parkash and another

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. S.S. Panag, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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 petition for amendment was brought by the tenant at the Appellate Court pointing out to an alleged subsequent event of the landlord coming by possession of yet another property through an eviction petition. The Court dismissed it finding that the instant rent petition is for eviction of a non-residential premise and the building which was got vacated through a Court order was in respect of the residential building put for residential purpose. The counsel would argue that the property that was got vacated had mixed user of property. The counsel, however, admits that the eviction was obtained by the landlord in respect of the other building only for residential purpose.

2. I do not think it was, therefore, competent for tenant to plead an additional subsequent event as of any relevance in the particular facts and circumstances. The lower Appellate Court was

justified in dismissing the application for amendment and I find no reason for making an interference with the order. The revision petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

May 28, 2015
Pankaj*