

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

**Civil Revision No.6604 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision:September 30, 2016.**

M/s Balajit Traders through its sole Proprietor

.....PETITIONER(s).

VERSUS

Kamlesh Navetia and another

....RESPONDENT(s).

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr. Rajat Gautam, Advocate
for the petitioner (s).

SURINDER GUPTA, J.

Heard.

2. This is petition against the order dated 09.09.2016 whereby the application of landlord was allowed and a local commissioner Engineer A.C. Goyal was allowed to inspect the demised premises.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the Rent Controller allowed the local commissioner by name as sought by the landlord instead of appointing as neutral person. In support of his submission, he has referred to the observation of Coordinate bench of this Court in case of *Parvinder Singh Vs. Ajay Sarna and another Civil Revision No.506 of 2016 decided on 27.01.2016.*

4. Local commissioner in this case was appointed on the application of landlord and he will depose, if so required, as the witness of the landlord. He has not been appointed by the Rent Controller suo moto,

as such, this submission that neutral person should have been appointed, have no basis. The respondent will have similar opportunity to seek appointment of 'local commissioner' at the time when the case is fixed for his evidence.

5. Perusal of the citation referred by counsel for the petitioner shows that the local commissioner in that case appear to have been appointed by the Court and not on the application of landlord, as such, are not applicable to the facts of the present case.

6. This revision petition has no merits.

Dismissed.

September 30, 2016.
Sachin M.

(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: ***Yes/No***

Whether Reportable: ***Yes/No***