

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

C.R. No. 2676 of 2001 (O & M)

Date of decision: 13.02.2017

Rajinder Pal

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Nirmala Rani (since deceased) through L.Rs. and others ...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SANDHAWALIA

Present: Mr. Parveen K. Kataria, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ramneeq Kaur, Advocate,
for respondents no. 1 and 2.

G.S.SANDHAWALIA, J. (Oral)

As per office report, notices issued to respondents no. 4 and 5 have been received back with the report that they have refused to accept the notices. Accordingly, the said respondents are deemed to have been duly served and proceeded against ex parte.

Counsel for the petitioner has pointed out that respondent no. 3 namely Sudharshana Rani was one of the respondents before the Rent Controller and had never challenged the eviction order before the Appellate Authority also. Therefore, it is submitted that she is not a necessary party.

Accordingly, her name is struck off from the array of parties.

Service is accordingly complete.

Ravinder Khanna, legal representative no. (iv) of respondent no. 1, as identified by his counsel Ms. Ramneeq Kaur, Advocate, is present in Court and submits that possession of the premises in question has already been taken through process of Court.

Counsel for the petitioner pleads no instructions since the case

is of the year 2001 and it is a reconstructed case having been burnt in the fire in the year 2011.

Keeping in view the above, the present revision petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous with liberty to apply for modification in case the petitioner's interests are adversely affected by the above said statement.

13.02.2017
shivani

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No