

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.R No. 1372 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of decision : April 11, 2016

Sunder Lal

..... Petitioner

v.

Paramjit Singh

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. AS Khinda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. RS Athwal, Advocate
for the respondent.

1. **Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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 petition has been filed against the concurrent orders of conviction filed against the petitioner.

The respondent had filed eviction petition against the petitioner and one other tenant on the ground of non-payment of rent. The other tenant accepted the respondent to be his landlord, paid the rent and consequently that petition was dismissed. The petitioner, on the other hand, denied the relationship of the landlord and the tenant by contending that actually what had been purchased by the respondent was a residential plot.

Both the Courts below noticed that this mis-statement in the

sale deed would not come to the benefit of the petitioner because he had at one time accepted that he was the tenant of the previous owner in the shop in question and he had also filed a complaint to the Collector under the Stamp Duty Act complaining that the previous owner had shown the shop to be a residential plot only to undervalue the sale deed in favour of the respondent.

In my opinion, the findings of the Courts below are correct and, therefore, it is held that the petitioner having denied title of his landlord consciously and knowingly is not entitled to the benefit of the protection given by the East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, 1949. Consequently, this petition is dismissed.

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

April 11, 2016
`kk'