

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

Date of Decision : 24.02.2016

1) CR-1128-2016

Amandeep Garg

..... Petitioner

Versus

Navgeet Singh Sekhon

..... Respondent

2) CR-1396-2016

Amandeep Garg

..... Petitioner

Versus

Navgeet Singh Sekhon

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Ms. Aarti Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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)

These are two revisions. In the revision bearing CR No.1128 of 2016 the petitioner has challenged the order whereby his application for appointment of a Local Commissioner to prove that the respondent-landlord

has five vacant shops was rejected. In revision bearing CR No.1396 of 2016 the petitioner has challenged the order whereby the application for amendment of the written statement to take the plea that the shops had become vacant was declined.

Notice of motion.

Mr. R.S. Ghuman, Advocate has entered appearance on behalf of the respondent.

After some arguments they have reached to the following agreement:-

“It is agreed that the petitioner-tenant shall not press the application for appointment of the Local Commissioner and will be given one effective opportunity at his own responsibility to prove the averment that vacant shops are lying with the respondent. On the other hand, the respondent will not take the objection to the fact that this specific plea did not form part of the written statement and the petitioner would be permitted to lead evidence as stated above.”

In the circumstances, the revision petitions are disposed of in the above terms.

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

February 24, 2016

ashish

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**