

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN

-
C.R.P.No.703 of 2016

ORDER:

This Civil Revision Petition, under Section 22 of the A.P. Buildings (Lease, Rent & Eviction) Control Act, 1960, is preferred by the petitioner-tenants against the order passed by the Additional Chief Judge, City Small Causes Court, Hyderabad in R.A.No.238 of 2013 dated 26.10.2015. The appeal preferred by the petitioners was dismissed by the Court below, confirming the eviction order passed in R.C.No.118 of 2011 dated 29.10.2013 by the Additional Rent Controller, Secunderabad, and the appellants were directed to vacate, and hand over vacant possession of the petition schedule property to the respondents, within three months from the date of the judgment.

The three months period, stipulated by the Appellate Court, expired on 25.01.2016. It is pursuant to the interim order of *status quo* passed by this Court on 14.03.2016 that the petitioners continue to retain possession of the subject property. Even in the interim order dated 14.03.2016 this Court recorded its disinclination to interfere with the concurrent findings of fact recorded by both the Courts below, and the order of *status quo* was passed granting time to the learned counsel for the revision petitioners to obtain instructions with regards the reasonable time required by them to vacate the said premises. Again, in its order dated 29.04.2016, this Court noted the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioners that six months time be granted for vacating the premises; and directed that the matter be listed after Summer Vacation, 2016. Even if six months time were to be granted, from the date of the order of this Court on 29.04.2016, the period would expire by 29.10.2016.

Even during the course of hearing today, after putting forth his submission for some time, Sri M.V.Swamy, learned counsel for the petitioners, would submit that, instead of an adjudication on merits, it would be suffice if this Court were to grant the petitioners six months time from today to vacate the property.

As the petitioners had sought six months time earlier before this Court on 29.04.2016, which period would expire by 29.10.2016, I consider

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

C.R.P.No.703 of 2016

-
-

Date: 10.06.2016

JSU