

107

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

C.R. No.2473 of 2016

Date of Decision : 26.04.2016

Raj Mehra

..... Petitioner

Versus

Sanjiv Krishan Sharma and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. M. K. Bhatnagar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. B.D. Sharma, Advocate
for the respondent No.1.

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.

On 06.04.2016 the following order was passed:-

“After arguing for some time, learned counsel states that he does not wish to press this revision on merits and he is

ready to vacate the said premises voluntarily without forcing the respondents to press the execution in case reasonable time is granted for the same.

I find this to be a fair submission.

Notice of motion.

Let the respondents be served through their counsel in the trial Court/Executing Court by way of dasti process.

Adjourned to 26.04.2016.

In the meantime, the dispossession of the petitioner shall remain stayed.

To be shown in the urgent list.”

Today with the intervention of learned counsel this dispute has been settled. In response to the offer made, the learned counsel for the respondent No.1-landlord on instructions has stated that in case the petitioner-tenant files an undertaking before the Rent Controller within 15 days that he would vacate the premises voluntarily and give vacant physical possession to the respondent No.1 on or before 31.10.2016 without forcing the respondent No.1 to press execution application and will continue to pay other charges regularly, he would not oppose the continuation of relationship of tenant-landlord till that date.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has stated that this offer is accepted to him. Another point raised by learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner has already deposited the rent upto 31.07.2017.

Learned counsel for the respondent No.1 states that he would have no objection if the rent upto 31.10.2016 is handed over to the respondent No.1 and the remaining is refunded back to the petitioner.

Allowed as prayed for.

Resultantly, the revision petition stands disposed of with a direction to the petitioner to file undertaking to the above effect. However, in case the said undertaking is not filed this petition would be deemed to be dismissed.

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

April 26, 2016

ashish

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**