

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

\*\*\*\*

**Date of Decision: 11.09.2017**

**1. CWP No.20567 of 2017**

**Harish Chander .....Petitioner**

**Vs.**

**State of Punjab and others .....Respondents**

**2. CWP No.20568 of 2017**

**Sarabjit Singh .....Petitioner**

**Vs.**

**State of Punjab and others .....Respondents**

**3. CWP No.20569 of 2017**

**Jagtar Singh .....Petitioner**

**Vs.**

**State of Punjab and others .....Respondents**

**4. CWP No.20570 of 2017**

**Kamal Bhatia .....Petitioner**

**Vs.**

**State of Punjab and others .....Respondents**

**5. CWP No.20571 of 2017**

**Ravi Kumar .....Petitioner**

**Vs.**

**State of Punjab and others .....Respondents**

**6. CWP No.20572 of 2017**

**Vipan Kumar .....Petitioner**

**Vs.**

**State of Punjab and others .....Respondents**

**7. CWP No.20573 of 2017**

**Vipan Kumar Handa .....Petitioner**

**Vs.**

**State of Punjab and others .....Respondents**

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN**

**Present:- Ms. Satpreet G. Kapila, Advocate for the petitioner.**

**\*\*\*\***

**Rakesh Kumar Jain, J. (Oral)**

This order shall dispose of a bunch of seven petitions bearing CWP No.20567 of 2017 to 20573 of 2017. However as the issue involved in all the petitions is same, for the sake of convenience, the facts are being taken from CWP No.20567 of 2017.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the Panchayat Samiti had constructed 84 shops on 01.08.1989. The petitioner's father was inducted as a tenant in the shop No.C-6. The landlord- respondent No.5 filed a petition under Sections 3, 5, 6 and 7 of Punjab Public Premises Eviction (Rent and Recovery), Act, (for short, 'the Act') for seeking eviction of the petitioner along with recovery of the rent. The said petition was allowed by the Collector, Hoshiarpur on 20.04.2015 and the petitioner was directed to deposit the rent and hand over the vacant possession. The said order has become final. The petitioner has submitted that the landlord/ respondent No.5 had given full assurance that he would not evict the petitioner, therefore, the said order was not challenged by way of an appeal before the Commissioner and now the present petition has been filed as the

petitioner feels threatened qua his dispossession.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and after perusal of record, found that there is no merit in the present petitions because order of eviction has already been passed by the competent Court on 20.04.2015 and has attained finality. Consequently, there is no scope for interference.

Dismissed.

**September 11, 2017**  
**renu**

**( RAKESH KUMAR JAIN )**  
**JUDGE**

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether Speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | Yes/No |