

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

118

**Civil Revision No.8518 of 2015
Date of Decision:15.12.2015**

Surinder Singh and anotherpetitioners

Versus

Babalpreet Singh Bablurespondent

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.G.S.Toor, Advocate
for the petitioners

ARUN PALLI, J.(ORAL):-

Vide order being assailed, dated 18.11.2015, rendered by Rent Controller, Barnala, evidence of the petitioners-landlord has since been closed.

Ex facie, the petitioners have been extremely negligent and remiss in pursuing their cause but it shall equally be true that in case, they are not afforded one effective opportunity to lead and conclude their evidence, they shall not only suffer an incalculable loss but that might also result in miscarriage of justice. As regards the inconvenience and the delay caused, respondent could always be compensated by awarding a suitable cost.

That being so, and without issuing any notice to the respondent to avert any further delay and the expenses that he shall have to incur to defend these proceedings, order dated 18.11.2015 is

set aside and the petition is disposed of, in the following terms:

1. Petitioners-landlord shall be afforded only one effective opportunity to lead and conclude their entire evidence on the date that shall be fixed by the Rent Controller, in this regard.
2. In the event, the petitioners-landlord fail to conclude their evidence on the designated date, their evidence shall be deemed to have been closed and no further adjournment shall be granted.
3. This, however, shall be subject to payment of costs of ₹ 20,000/-, which shall be condition precedent.

15.12.2015

neenu

**(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE**