

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

**115**

**Civil Revision No.7981 of 2015(O & M)  
Date of Decision:30.11.2015**

Gurpreet Singh Kohli

....petitioner

Versus

Ram Murti

.....respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI**

- 1.Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgement?**
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?**

Present: Mr.H.S.Brar, Advocate  
for the petitioner

\*\*\*

**ARUN PALLI, J.(ORAL):-**

Vide order being assailed, dated 19.09.2015, rendered by Rent Controller, Roopnagar, application moved by the petitioner-tenant seeking amendment in his written statement had since been dismissed.

All what is sought to be urged, vide the proposed amendment, is that the respondent-landlord had other shops adjacent to the demised premises and also the rooms on the first floor of the shop in dispute. Earlier those rooms were on rent but subsequently, were got vacated by the respondent-landlord and he had affixed the board of 'To Let'.

Ex facie, what is sought to be pleaded by way of amendment is nothing but the instances in the nature of an evidence to show that the alleged need of the respondent is not true, genuine

or conceived in good faith, as even other accommodation was/is available to the landlord. Before the Rent Controller, evidence of the petitioner-tenant is being recorded and that being so, he could always, and, is at liberty to adduce an appropriate evidence, qua an aspect, an amendment in the written statement is being claimed. Needless to assert, once any such evidence is brought on record, Rent Controller, shall evaluate the same while drawing a final analysis at the stage of arguments.

That being so, no interference in exercise of revisional jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is warranted. The petition is disposed of in above terms.

30.11.2015  
*neenu*

**(ARUN PALLI)**  
**JUDGE**