

115

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

C.R. No.2959 of 2016(O&M)

Date of Decision : 28.04.2016

Satpal and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

Dera Mahant Tara Singh Addan Shahi Dharamshala

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Ashok Giri, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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 eviction which have been passed against the petitioners on the ground that they failed to deposit the provisional rent assessed by the trial Court even after due opportunities were granted to them.

Firstly the learned counsel for the petitioners states that today the petitioners have got the draft of entire arrears of rent. Further the contention of learned counsel for the petitioners is that their lawyer did not tell them that the provisional rent had been assessed and that the eviction petition had been decided. However, the learned counsel has fairly accepted

that in terms of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of *Rakesh Wadhawan and others vs. Jagdamba Industrial Corporation and others, reported as 2002(2) Civil & Rent Judicial Reports 387* only one opportunity is required by the tenant to deposit after the assessment of provisional rent.

In the present case, the petitioners were duly represented and opportunities were duly granted. What their counsel did or did not do it is between the petitioners and him. In the circumstances, I find no fault with the findings of the Courts below.

Petition is dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending Civil Misc. Application, if any, also stands disposed of.

April 28, 2016
ashish

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE