

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

CR-2136-2004 (O&M)

Date of decision : 27.01.2016

Jaswinder Singh and another

..... Petitioners

versus

Sukhbinder Singh

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. G.B.S.Gill, Advocate for
Mr. H.S.Bhullar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Deepak Thapar, 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 by the landlord against the concurrent orders of dismissal of the petition on the ground of ceasure to occupy.

Both the Courts below have minutely discussed the evidence and have returned a concurrent finding of fact that the only objective material relied upon by the petitioners was the consumption of electricity which, has been rightly pointed out can never be a proof by itself, more so when it transpired that the meter was also found to be defective.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the fact that service on the respondent was effected at some other house has also proved the fact that he was not residing at the premises. This fact has also been considered by the Courts below. After having gone through the record with the assistance of both the learned counsel, I regret my inability to return the finding that the approach or decision of the Courts below was erroneous or perverse.

I find no merit in the present revision. Consequently, the same is dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending civil miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

27.01.2016

Pooja sharma-I

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**