

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

**Civil Revision No.1155 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision:February 20, 2018.**

Amlesh Sharma and another

.....PETITIONER(s).

VERSUS

Suresh Kumar Singla

....RESPONDENT(s).

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr. Surinder Singh Virk, Advocate
for the petitioner (s).

SURINDER GUPTA, J.

Heard.

This is revision petition against the order dated 13.12.2017 passed by Appellate Authority, Panipat whereby appeal filed by the revision petitioners against the order of the Rent Controller, Panipat allowing the petition filed by respondent Suresh Kumar Singla under Section 13 of Haryana Urban (Control of Rent and Eviction), Act was dismissed.

Respondent-landlord has sought ejectment of revision petitioners-tenant from the demised premises to expand his business and for settling his family member. As per the respondent-landlord, he is carrying business of manufacturing of carpets and chemicals and require more space for expanding his business and the premises in possession of revision petitioners-tenant is most suitable place for expanding his business.

Revision petitioners have taken the demised premises on rent for storing

their waste material but thereafter started business of sale of chemicals.

The Rent Controller found the need of the respondent-landlord as genuine and ordered ejectment of revision petitioners from the demised premises with direction to them to vacate the demised premises within two months of the date of judgment. Findings of the Rent Controller were affirmed by the Appellate Authority.

Learned counsel for the revision petitioners submits that the plea of respondent-landlord while projecting his need of the demised premises is that he required the same to expand his business and to adjust his family member but he has neither named any of his family member, he intends to adjust in his business nor examined any such family member; secondly, the respondent-landlord is projecting the need without placing on record any document that he has a flourishing business of carpets and chemicals which he wants to expand and thirdly, there are other godowns in the premises which are in possession of other tenants and no ejectment petition has been filed against any other tenant.

On perusal of the judgments passed by the Courts below, I find that these pleas were also raised and were duly answered. In order to expand his business, a person is not required to give account of his business and to prove that he is having a flourishing business. Respondent-landlord was also not required to give the name of the family member, he wants to adjust in his business as the need was not projected for bona fide necessity of any family member of the respondent-landlord. Even otherwise, it is for the landlord to see the suitability of the premises for carrying his business, as such, not filing of ejectment petition against other tenant, in no manner,

affects his bona fide need.

On perusal of the judgments passed by the Courts below, which are quite elaborated, I find no legal or factual infirmity therein calling for any interference.

This revision petition has no merits.

Dismissed.

February 20, 2018.
Sachin M.

(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: ***Yes/No***

Whether Reportable: ***Yes/No***