

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

CR No. 1096 of 1993

Date of Decision : 27.01.2016

M/s Bharat Trading Company

..... Petitioner

Versus

Pt.Banwari Lal

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Prateek Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Girish Agnihotri, Sr. Advocate with
Mr.Arvind Seth, 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?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

This revision has been filed against the concurrent orders of eviction passed against the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that he has already deposited rent for one year. Learned counsel for the respondent states that he does not know if it is correct.

With the intervention of learned counsel the matter has been settled and both have obtained instructions from their respective clients. It has been agreed that in case the petitioner files an undertaking that he will continue to deposit the rent in advance by the 7th of every month and will vacate the premises voluntarily on or before

31.03.2017 without forcing the respondent to file an execution petition the respondent will permit him to stay till 31.03.2017.

The petition is disposed of in the above terms. However, it is made clear that if the petitioner does not file the necessary undertaking or fails to deposit the rent in advance by the 7th of every month this petition would be deemed to be dismissed. In case the amount of rent for one year has been deposited as stated above, the respondent will be at liberty to withdraw the same.

January 27, 2016
sunita

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE