

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

**Civil Revision No.14 of 2016
Date of Decision: January 07, 2016.**

Sunil Kumar

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

Kailash Chand Gupta and another

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr. A.K. Jindal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SURINDER GUPTA, J.

Heard.

This revision petition is against the order dated 15th December, 2015, whereby, the application filed by petitioner to lead additional evidence was dismissed.

In order to prove that respondent-landlord owns other properties, the petitioner had already examined and summoned the clerk from Income Tax Department and other witnesses.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that official of the Income Tax Department earlier appeared and could not produce the entire record, as the PAN number of respondent was not available. Now, he has supplied the PAN number to summon the income tax returns filed by the respondent, showing the properties owned and possessed by him.

On perusal of the order dated 15th December, 2015, it transpires

that the respondent-landlord has filed petition under Section 13 of the Haryana Urban (Control of Rent and Eviction) Act, 1973, seeking ejectment of petitioner from the demised premises on the ground of personal bona fide necessity. Earlier, the evidence of the petitioner was closed on 20th October, 2015 and thereafter, he filed revision petition, which was allowed by this Court vide order dated 4th November, 2015, allowing him only one opportunity to conclude the evidence. Thereafter, he filed the instant application. After discussing the facts in detail, learned Rent Controller has rightly observed that the attempt by the petitioner is only to delay the proceedings.

No reason is made out to grant any further adjournment to lead evidence.

This petition has no merits.

Dismissed.

January 07, 2016.
v.saini

(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE