

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

137

CR No.2615 of 2018 (O & M)
Date of Decision:22.10.2018

Sushil Kumar @ Shital

...Petitioner

Versus

Narinder Singh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Rakesh Chopra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. A.P.S. Rehan, Advocate
for the respondent.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.(Oral)
CM-7892-CII – 2018

Allowed as prayed for.

Main Case.

Tenant-petitioner is in the revision petition against the concurrent findings of fact arrived at by both the courts below ordering his eviction on the ground that the premises is bona fide requirement for the son of the owner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that although it has been projected before the Courts below that son of the landlord has a licence for running a Chemist shop, however, same has not been produced.

Learned counsel for the petitioner could not draw attention of the Court to any such argument raised before the Courts below. In exercise of revisional jurisdiction, this Court cannot permit the petitioner to raise a fresh argument, which has not been pressed before the Courts below. Still

further, the eviction has also been ordered by the Courts on non-payment of rent.

Revision petition is dismissed.

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

22.10.2018

sheetal

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No