

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

112

CR No.2138 of 2015 (O & M)
Date of Decision:24.07.2018

Ram Lal

...Petitioner

Versus

Nachatter Singh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Pankaj Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Amanpreet Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. H.N.S. Gill, Advocate
for the respondent.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.(Oral)

Tenant-petitioner is in the revision petition against the order passed by the learned Rent Controller, affirmed in appeal, ordering eviction on the ground of personal necessity.

Respondent-landlord had filed a petition claiming that the accommodation available with him is insufficient as his sons are now married and property is required for personal necessity of the family. Defendant pleaded that necessary requirements of Section 13 of the East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, 1949 have not been pleaded.

Both the Courts have examined this issue and found that the tenant-petitioner has only produced on record copies of two assessment orders issued by the Municipal Committee to prove ownership. However, when this fact was put to the son of the petitioner, who appeared in

evidence, he denied that he owned any property. Tenant-petitioner did not

lead any evidence to prove that either the landlord or his sons were in occupation of any other property in the urban area concerned.

In view thereof, there is no ground to interfere.

Revision petition is dismissed.

All the miscellaneous applications, if any, are disposed of, in view of the above said judgment.

24.07.2018
sheetal

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No