

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR No.848 of 2012(O&M)
Date of decision: 05.11.2015

Rajeev Kumar Sinha

... Petitioner

Versus

Narinder Aggarwal

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Ms. Amrita Nagpal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Lokesh Sinhal, Advocate for the respondent.

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)

Respondent-landlord has filed an application for disposal of the revision petition and for release of the amount lying deposited in the court.

Learned counsel for the respondent-landlord submits that the present revision petition has become infructuous, as possession of the demised premises had since been obtained. The application is also accompanied by an affidavit of the petitioner-tenant, namely, Rajeev Kumar Sinha, which also indicates that tenant had already received a sum of ₹ 1,60,000/- from the respondent-landlord i.e. the amount over and above the assessed rent by the Rent Controller and was deposited by the tenant.

That being so, learned counsel for the applicant/respondent contends that the amount that is lying deposited in the court of Rent Controller, Faridabad, in terms of the order passed by this court dated 28.08.2012, is now required to be released to the respondent-landlord.

Accordingly, the main case is taken on board and the civil revision petition is dismissed as having become infructuous. And respondent-landlord shall be at liberty, in the wake of the above development, to move an appropriate application before the court concerned for release of the said amount. Needless to say, the court shall pass appropriate order.

November 5, 2015
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge