

106

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

**C.R. No. 2455 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 31.05.2016**

Naveen Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

Roop Lata

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Manoj Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Akshay Jindal, 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 against the concurrent orders of the Courts below allowing ejectment of the petitioner-tenant from the demised premises.

After arguing for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, states that the petitioner will not press this revision on merits and will vacate the premises voluntarily on or before 31.05.2017 without forcing the respondent-landlady to press execution petition and will

continue to pay the monthly contractual rent in advance by the 7th of every month, and pay the other admissible charges regularly. He further undertakes to pay upto date arrears of rent, if any, within a period of one month from today.

Learned counsel for the respondent, on instructions, has also accepted this offer on the condition that the petitioner will file an undertaking to the above effect before the Executing Court within one month, with the condition that in the event of any default, this petition would be deemed to be dismissed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has accepted this condition.

Resultantly, the revision petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

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

May 31, 2016

sunita/pooja sharma-I

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**