

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Civil Revision No.1587 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of Order:19.09.2018

Satpal

..Petitioner

Versus

Bipan Kumar and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Sherry K. Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S.Sidhu, Advocate, for
Mr. G.S.Kaura, Advocate,
for the respondents.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

Landlord-petitioner is in the revision petition against the orders passed by the learned Rent Controller affirmed by the learned Appellate Authority, dismissing petition for eviction of the tenant-respondent.

Learned Appellate Authority has recorded two facts which are not shown to be erroneous:-

- (1) It is admitted by landlord that Dev Raj, respondent-tenant in fact comes to the shop in dispute.
- (2) PW5 Sat Pal, the appellant, admits in cross-examination that Dev Raj, the tenant, is in possession of the premises.

It is pleaded case of the landlord that since a Public Call Office has been opened in the shop in question and connection of the Public Call Office from BSNL is in the name of son, therefore, there is sub-letting.

Both the courts after examining the evidence have found that there is no evidence of parting with the possession of the shop in question.

Learned counsel for the petitioner made sincere effort to persuade this court to take a different view but could not point out any perversity or non-reading or misreading of evidence by the courts below.

Hence, this court does not find any good ground to interfere.

The civil revision petition is dismissed.

September 19, 2018
nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
Whether reportable	: Yes/No