

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

-.-

Civil Revision No. 3590 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 16.08.2018

Ravinder Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

Rajender Singh and another

.....Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

-.-

Present: Mr. R D Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner

-.-

Rekha Mittal, J. (Oral)

The present petition directs challenge against concurrent findings recorded by the Courts whereby application for eviction on the grounds of personal necessity of the demised premises by the respondents themselves and their sons as well as that the shop in question being unfit and unsafe for human habitation has been allowed. The appeal preferred by the tenant/petitioner did not find favour with the Appellate Authority, Narnaul whereby eviction on the aforesaid two grounds was affirmed.

The sole submission made by counsel is that the respondents/landlords are in possession of two more shops in the urban area concerned, eviction on the ground of personal necessity is not tenable.

I have heard counsel for the petitioner and perused the paper book particularly the judgments impugned.

Counsel for the petitioner, in response to a query by the Court, would fairly inform that the petitioner failed to adduce evidence to

substantiate his plea qua the aforesaid aspect. I have gone through the judgments passed by the Courts but unable to find out any patent illegality or material irregularity, warranting intervention in exercise of revisional jurisdiction.

For the foregoing reasons, the petition fails and is accordingly dismissed in limine.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

16.08.2018
mohan bimbra

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