

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****Date of decision: 18.09.2017****CR No.6317 of 2017 (O&M)**

Sadhu Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

Gurpreet Singh & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Raman Chawla, Advocate, for the petitioner.

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (ORAL)

This revision petition has been filed by the father of the petitioner in CR No.6080 of 2017 titled 'Jagroop Singh Vs. Gurpreet Singh & another' decided vide separate order of even date. The present petitioner had filed an application under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC in Rent Petition bearing No.RP/537/14 pending before the Rent Controller, Ludhiana. The Rent Controller has dismissed the application for good and sufficient reasons. The presence of the petitioner is not necessary for determination of controversy between the petitioner in the connected revision petition (CR No.6080 of 2017) and the respondent claiming to be landlord/owner. Father and son duo are to be seen mixed up to try and avert proceedings for eviction from the demised shop and to protract the trial one way or the other. If the father was so interested, he could have filed a title suit and not set up a case that he has passed on the possession to his son or that he got the possession of the demised shop from one Bihari Lal long years ago. It is not the case that the petitioners in both the cases have built their case on title deeds to the property in dispute. The Rent Controller, Ludhiana has done well in

CR No.6317 of 2017 (O&M)

dismissing the application and I affirm that order. Consequently, the petition is also dismissed being devoid of merit.

18.09.2017
Vimal

[RAJIV NARAIN RAINA]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes*

Whether Reportable: *No*