

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR No.6051 of 2015(O&M)
Date of decision: 16.09.2015

Krishan Lal (since deceased) through LR Anil Kumar
... Petitioner

Versus

Shri Jainendra Gurukul, Panchkula and others
... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. YP Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Adarsh Jain, Advocate
for the caveator-respondent.

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?

ARUN PALLI J. (Oral)

Vide order dated 01.05.2012, rendered by the Rent Controller, Panchkula, eviction of the petitioner-tenant was ordered from the demised premises on account of personal necessity. As the appeal preferred against the said order failed and was dismissed on 30.04.2015, petitioner-tenant is before this court.

On a due and comprehensive consideration of the matter in issue and the evidence on record, the courts below concluded that the respondent is an educational institution and intended to start a University for imparting better

education to the students. Thus, it needs the premises in question to meet their requirement and projects.

During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the caveator-respondent has placed on record two orders passed by the coordinate Benches of this court in separate revision petitions i.e. dated 29.10.2014 [Civil Revision No.661 of 2014] and dated 21.11.2014 [Civil Revision Nos.3092 & 4633 of 2014]. And submits that the matter in issue was directly and substantially involved in the said two cases, as eviction of other tenants vis-à-vis the other premises situated in the same campus was ordered by the authorities and this court had dismissed the civil revisions preferred by the tenants.

Learned counsel for the petitioner-tenant does not dispute this position and rather fairly submits that the issue involved in the matter in hand and the above-said civil revisions is common. And the orders passed in those cases would cover the issue in the matter in hand as well.

Nothing could be pointed out by learned counsel for the petitioner as to how the conclusions, that have concurrently been arrived at by the courts below, were either contrary to the position on record or suffered from any material illegality.

That being so, no interference is warranted in exercise of revisional jurisdiction, under Section 15(6) of the

Haryana Urban (Control of Rent & Eviction) Act, 1973. Petition being devoid of merit is accordingly dismissed.

September 16, 2015
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge