

114

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

CR No.2207 of 2016

Date of Decision : 29.03.2016

Anju Bala

..... Petitioner

Versus

Raj Kumari and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Sushant Kohli, 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)

This petition has been filed against the concurrent orders of the Courts below vide which provisional rent was fixed @ ₹8,000/- per month.

The respondent had filed the petition for eviction and para 2 of the reply was as follows:

“2. That the para No.2 of petition is correct to extent respondent is tenant in the shop in question, rent is ₹800/- per month and execution of rent note and extension of the same has been concealed. The rest para is denied.”

In view of this, the Courts below found that the petitioner had not denied the rent note and consequently by relying on a photocopy thereof assessed the rent at the rate mentioned therein.

The appeal having been dismissed, the petitioner is

before this Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that actually the petitioner intended to deny the execution of the rent note.

I am afraid no such meaning can be attributed to the averments reproduced above. Apart from these averments, the Courts below have also relied upon a contempt petition filed by the petitioner wherein she had taken the plea that thumb impressions had been obtained on the rent note by fraud. The Courts below have held that this amounted to admission of execution.

I find no reason to take a different view. The petition is dismissed.

March 29, 2016

jt

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**