

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

CR No.4142 of 2017

Date of Decision:-05.07.2017

Parkash Chand.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

Bimla Devi.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- Mr. Ram Darshan Yadav, Advocate for the Petitioner.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner(tenant) is in revision against the concurrent findings returned by both the learned Rent Controller, Rewari vide judgment dated 04.07.2016 and learned Appellate Authority, Rewari vide judgment dated 23.05.2017 whereby the petitioner (tenant) has been evicted from the demised shop on the ground of personal necessity of the respondent (landlady).

Counsel for the petitioner (tenant) heard.

The relationship of the tenant and landlord was not in dispute. The personal necessity for having office of practicing advocate son was pleaded and proved by the advocate son appearing as PW-6. The petitioner (tenant) himself admitted in the cross that the son was the practicing advocate and did not have an independent office. It is also not in dispute that the shop was originally let out for business, however, was now being

being used for the purpose of godown. It is also not in dispute that the possession of the demised shop already stands resumed through the process of the Court by the landlady.

In view of the above no ground for interference is made out.

Dismissed.

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

July 05, 2017
Vinay

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>