

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CR No.6097 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 27.10.2017

Simarjit Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Pritpal Kaur

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Arjun Veer Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Jaidka, Advocate,
for the caveator-respondent.

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.(Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to convince the Court on the merits of the rent petition and the eviction order. The ground for eviction pleaded by the respondent landlady is that she resides in Delhi in rented accommodation and needs to shift to her own house in Ludhiana. The need appears to be eminently bona fide. The Court would not assume to start with that personal need of landlord is not bona fide in the request made in the claim petition that she wants to shift to Ludhiana. Her children are settled elsewhere and she wants her house back residence. She is a septuagenarian widow.

2. I find no infirmity in the order of the Rent Controller or in the Appellate Authority, Ludhiana to warrant interference in revision under Section 15 of the East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, 1949.

3. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and the petitioner in person, a reasonable time is given to him to vacate the premises by June 30, 2018 and handover its possession to the respondent landlady. He shall also clear the arrears of rent before leaving. The petitioner will file an affidavit before the Rent Controller undertaking to vacate the premises in terms of this order. He would do so within one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

4. In case, rent has been deposited in the Treasury, the Rent Controller would release it in favour of the landlady.

5. With these observations and directions, the petition is disposed of.

27.10.2017
manju

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes*

Whether reportable *No*