

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

**Civil Revision No.6764 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: November 29, 2016.**

Satnam Singh

.....PETITIONER(s).

VERSUS

Darshan Singh

....RESPONDENT(s).

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr. Vikram Anand, Advocate
for the petitioner (s).

Mr. Sudhir Paruthi, Advocate
for the respondent.

SURINDER GUPTA, J.

Heard.

This is revision petition against the order dated 17.09.2016, whereby the evidence of revision petitioner-landlord was closed by order.

Revision petitioner-landlord filed petition under Section 13 of East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, 1949 on 13.05.2011, wherein the issues were framed on 14.05.2012. The revision petitioner failed to conclude the evidence by 17.09.2016 which led the Rent Controller to conclude his evidence by order.

Learned counsel of the revision petitioner has sought two adjournments to conclude the evidence, subject to payment of heavy costs.

Learned counsel for the respondent submits that the petitioner

has already been afforded numerous opportunities during the period of more than four years but he failed to conclude his evidence which compelled the Rent Controller to close his evidence by order and there is no justification in allowing him further opportunity.

It is apparent that the revision petitioner has already been allowed enough time and opportunities to conclude his evidence but keeping in view the submission of learned counsel for the revision petitioner and in the interest of justice, the revision petition is allowed. Revision petitioner is allowed two more opportunities to conclude his evidence, subject to payment of ₹20,000/- as costs, which will be deposited with Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court within two weeks by way of demand draft. In the event of costs being deposited and the receipt produced before the Rent Controller, the petitioner will give list of witnesses and produce them at own responsibility before the Rent Controller. The Rent Controller will allow him two opportunities to produce and conclude his evidence at own responsibility. In the event of evidence being not concluded in two opportunities no further opportunity shall be allowed.

November 29, 2016.
Sachin M.

(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE

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

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