

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

Second Appeal No.153 of 2017

JUDGMENT:

The second appeal arises out of concurrent judgments of eviction passed by both the Courts below.

2. Heard Ms. V. Dyumani, learned counsel for the appellant and Sri T. Vinod Kumar, learned counsel appearing for the respondent-landlord.

3. A careful perusal of the judgments of both the Courts below would show that both the Courts have examined the facts and evidence in the proper perspective and came to the conclusion that the appellant was liable to be evicted. No substantial question of law arises for consideration in the above appeal.

4. However, the fact remains that the appellant is a Nationalized Bank. Since the relocation of the Bank would depend upon security features of a new property, the appellant cannot be treated as any other tenant. Therefore, while dismissing the appeal, the appellant is granted time up to 31-03-2018 to vacate and handover the vacant possession of the property. A responsible Officer of the Appellant-Bank shall file an affidavit undertaking to this effect immediately after reopening of the Court.

Accordingly, the Second Appeal is dismissed. No costs. As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J

Date: 28-04-2017

Ksn