

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

**Regular Second Appeal No.4875 of 2013 (O&M)
Date of Decision: February 11, 2016.**

Joginder Singh

.....APPELLANT.

VERSUS

Sahib Singh

.....RESPONDENT.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate
for the appellant (s).

SURINDER GUPTA, J.

Heard.

This is appeal against the concurrent judgments of the Courts below, whereby the appellant-defendant was directed to vacate the demised premises within one month and hand over its possession to the respondent-plaintiff.

Admitted facts of the case are that respondent-plaintiff Sahib Singh is the owner of the suit property and the appellant-defendant was a tenant therein. His tenancy was terminated vide notice dated 31.08.2009 under Section 106 of Transfer of Property Act.

Learned counsel for appellant-defendant has argued that respondent-plaintiff had purchased the suit property, but sale deed in his favour is not binding on tenancy rights of appellant.

The Courts below, on appraisal of evidence on record, have concluded that the plaintiff had purchased the disputed shop from its previous owner and held the notice sent to the defendant terminating his tenancy as legal and valid.

On perusal of the record and judgments of the Courts below, I find no legal or factual infirmity therein calling for any interference.

No substantial question of law requiring determination arises in this appeal, which has no merits.

Dismissed.

February 11, 2016.
Sachin M.

(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE