

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

**CR No.747 of 2005 (O&M)
Date of decision: 16.09.2015**

M/s Jiwan Lal and Company Tappa

..Petitioner

Versus

Food Corporation of India and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

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?

Present: Ms. Rajwinder Kaur, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. K.K.Gupta, Advocate,
for the respondents.

ARUN PALLI, J.(ORAL)

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that as the demised premises has already been vacated by the respondent(s)-tenant and the possession is restored to the petitioner-landlord, nothing substantive survives in the petition and the same be dismissed as having become infructuous.

Learned counsel for the petitioner pleads ignorance to this aspect and submits that let the petition be dismissed as having become infructuous, however, she be afforded liberty to move an application for its revival and decision on merit, in case, any dispute, cause of action or interest still survives.

Dismissed as infructuous with liberty aforesaid.

16th September, 2015

vandana

**(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE**