

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

CR No.776 of 2015

Date of Decision:04.02.2015

Tarsem Lal Petitioner

Vs.

Ram ParkashRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN

Present: Mr.Rajeev Dev Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J. (ORAL)

The tenant is in revision directed against the orders of ejectment passed by both the Courts below on the ground that he has ceased to occupy the demised premises for a period of one year.

The concurrent finding of fact has been recorded on the ground that the electricity was found disconnected for more than a year and therefore, it was presumed that the petitioner has ceased to occupy the demised premises which he is required to occupy upto four months continuously because if he cease to occupy the demised premises continuously for a period of more than 4 months then a presumption is drawn that he is not occupying the demised premises.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is a mechanic by occupation and for that purpose electricity is not required.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and perusal of the record, I am of the considered opinion that there is no merit in this petition because electricity is required even for a mechanic.

In view therefore, I do not find any merit in the present case and hence, the same is hereby dismissed.

VIVEK PAHWA
2015.02.05 12:57
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

**(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE**

04.02.2015

Vivek