

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

251

CR No. 857 of 2016

Date of Decision: December 19, 2016

Balwinder Pal

...Petitioner

Versus

Joginder Pal

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Atul Goel, Advocate
for the respondent.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (Oral):

Learned counsel for the respondent states that the revision petition was primarily filed for restoration of the electricity connection but during the pendency of the revision petition, the petitioner, who was tenant in the demised premises, has handed over the vacant possession of the same to the respondent-landlord and it is, for this reason, the counsel for the petitioner had not come on 31.03.2016 when the case was taken up for hearing and thereafter as well.

In the light of the statement made by the counsel for the respondent, the present revision petition is disposed of as infructuous with liberty to the petitioner to revive the same in case the statement of the counsel for the respondent is found to be incorrect.

**(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE**

December 19, 2016

Harish

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No