

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

**Civil Revision No.6059 of 2015 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision: September 16, 2015**

**Sunil Kumar**

**.... Petitioner**

**vs.**

**Kundan Lal and others**

**.... Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH**

**Present:** Mr. Munish Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

*1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

**Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)**

The petitioner has challenged the order dated 11.08.2015 (Annexure P-6) passed by learned Rent Controller (wrongly mentioned in the order as Judicial Magistrate Ist Class) Narnaul, whereby the amendment of the ejectment petition was allowed to incorporate the fact that the landlord has not vacated any tenanted shop situated at Narnaul nor he is in possession of any tenanted shop.

The said plea is a legal plea. There is no illegality in allowing such plea. Therefore, there is no ground to interfere in the impugned order.

Accordingly, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

**(KULDIP SINGH)  
JUDGE**

**September 16, 2015**  
sarita