

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

C.R. No.444 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 03.02.2016

Gulzar Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Harjit Kaur

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. L.M. Gulati, 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 revision has been filed against the concurrent judgments and orders of eviction passed against the petitioner.

The only ground taken by the learned counsel is that though the respondent had correctly filed an eviction petition under Section 13 of the East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, 1949 before the Court of Rent Controller yet the judgment and order shows that it had been decided by the Civil Judge, Junior Division and even decree-sheet had been prepared. Not only that, even when the petitioner filed an appeal the same had been decided and even a decree-sheet had been prepared therein and even in the execution application the orders were passed by the Judicial Magistrate Ist

Class. Learned counsel has however not denied that apart from this mistake in the nomenclature and the drawing up of superfluous decree, there is no other infirmity in the orders.

In my opinion, the technical mistake by the Courts below can not prejudice the respondent for no fault of his own.

In the circumstances, the petition is dismissed.

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

February 03, 2016

ashish

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**