

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

**CR No. 67 of 2016 (O& M)
Date of decision: 10.03.2016**

Des Raj(deceased) through LRs **.... Petitioner**

Vs.

Surinder Pal and another **.... Respondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr. Prateek Sodhi, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr.Vaibhav Narang, Advocate
for the respondents.

1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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)

After arguing for some time, the matter has been settled between the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) on instructions from his client states that if the petitioner(s) is granted adequate time i.e. 2 years to relocate his business he would undertake to vacate the premises voluntarily without forcing the respondent to press its execution. Learned counsel for respondents has stated that in case the petitioner(s) undertakes to vacate the premises by 30.06.2017 he would not claim any rent from the petitioner(s) and further, petitioner (s) should file an undertaking with regard to the intention of vacating the premises voluntarily without forcing him to press the execution.

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) has accepted this condition.

Accordingly, present petition is dismissed as not pressed with the clarification that petitioner(s) would have to vacate the

premises voluntarily on or before 30.06.2017 and will file an undertaking in this regard before the Executing Court. In case the petitioner(s) file any such undertaking in the Executing Court the respondent agrees to waive off the claim of rent from the petitioners. In the event of default, the petition would be deemed to be dismissed.

March 10, 2016
sonia

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE