

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

CR-3007-2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision:-7.5.2018

Ved Parkash Arora

... Petitioner

Versus

Bhupinder Khurmi and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Amit Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

By way of filing this revision petition, the petitioner/tenant assails judgment dated 15.3.2018 passed by the Appellate Authority, Ludhiana, whereby the ejectment order passed by the learned Rent Controller, Ludhiana directing the petitioner/tenant to vacate the demised premises, has been upheld.

The learned counsel for the petitioner/tenant has submitted that the ejectment has mainly been ordered on the ground of *bona fide* personal necessity, whereas in fact the petitioner/tenant is owning other shops in the area, which he had not mentioned and had concealed the said vital information.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner/tenant.

Nothing could be shown to this Court from which it could be said that the landlord is indeed running his business from some other premises owned by him. I do not find any infirmity in the concurrent findings to this effect as recorded by the Courts below. There is no

misreading of evidence so as to justify any interference in the impugned judgment.

At this stage, the learned Counsel for the petitioner/tenant submits that he may be permitted to withdraw the present petition and granted some additional time to vacate the premises in question.

In view of the aforesaid request, the present petition is disposed of as withdrawn. However, the time granted to the petitioner/tenant for vacating the demised premises is extended and he shall vacate the demised premises by 31.3.2019.

7.5.2018

pankaj

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No