

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR No.7762 of 2015
Date of decision: 19.11.2015

Shivji Ram and another

... Petitioners

Versus

Ramnish Gupta and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Yogesh Gupta, Advocate for the petitioners.

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 being assailed, dated 09.09.2015, rendered by Rent Controller, Sangrur, application moved by the respondent-tenant seeking landlord to produce certain documents, had since been disposed of with the following observations:

“2. Heard on the application moved by respondent No.2 for production of documents. Petitioner has filed the reply to the application in which he has stated that documents mentioned in the application has not been referred in the Rent petition. Petitioner has only relied upon rent note dated 08.08.2007 and same is already on the file. The petitioner has not stated anything about the documents which are required to be produced from his custody by the respondent. In these circumstances, the application is disposed of with

the adverse inference to be drawn at the appropriate stage.”

Apparently, in an application moved by the respondent-tenant, he prayed for a direction to the petitioner to produce certain documents. For, the petitioner had only relied upon a rent note dated 08.08.2007, and as the same was already on record, the application was disposed of with an observation that none of the documents, which the respondent required the petitioner to produce, were pleaded in the eviction petition. Petitioner is aggrieved only qua the observation **“In these circumstances, the application is disposed of with the adverse inference to be drawn at the appropriate stage.”** In my view, the observation recorded by the Rent Controller is wholly innocuous and the court would draw an inference, admissible in law, at an appropriate stage.

That being so, no ground is made out to interfere with the order being assailed, dated 09.09.2015, in exercise of revisional jurisdiction, under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. Petition being devoid of merit is accordingly dismissed.

November 19, 2015
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge