

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

Civil Revision No.3113 of 2017
Date of decision: May 02, 2017

Inderjit Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

Surinder Kumar etc. ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Ms. Mamta Malik Rewar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Rajan Gupta, J.

Present revision petition is directed against the order dated 11.04.2017, passed by Rent Controller, Chandigarh, whereby two applications, one moved by the petitioner and another by respondents No.2 (B) and 2 (C), under Order 18 Rule 3 & 17 CPC to examine signature of respondent No.2A(i), have been declined.

Order has been challenged before this court on the ground that the court below has erroneously dismissed the applications. Learned counsel submits that the order is unsustainable in law.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and given careful thought to the facts of the case.

It appears that petitioner filed a rent petition for ejectment of respondent No.1 on the ground of non-payment of rent. During pendency of proceedings, two applications were moved, one by the petitioner and

another by respondents No.2 (B) and 2 (C) under Order 18 Rule 3 & 17 CPC to examine signature of respondent No.2A(i). Keeping in view facts and circumstances of the case, trial court dismissed both the applications by observing that respondents No.2 (B) and 2 (C) had failed to file such application during their evidence and petitioner had no locus standi to file application on similar facts. I find no infirmity with the order passed by the trial court. It appears that instant applications have been filed only to delay proceedings of the rent petition. The revision petition is, thus, without any merit and is hereby dismissed.

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE

May 02, 2017
'Rajpal'