

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR-5709-2018(O&M)
Date of Order:01.10.2018

INDERPAL SINGH

..Petitioner

Versus

DHARAM GULATI

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

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

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J (Oral)

At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner has pointed out that in execution of the decree of eviction, possession of the premises has been delivered to the landlady.

Tenant-petitioner is in the revision petition against the concurrent findings of fact arrived at by the learned Rent Controller, affirmed by the learned Appellate Authority, ordering eviction on the ground of bonafide requirement for the grand son of the landlady who is residing in a rental accommodation. To prove the bonafide requirement, landlady had appeared as PW1 and her grand son had appeared as PW2.

Although, learned counsel for the petitioner made sincere attempt to persuade this court to take a different view, however, keeping in view the fact that the leaned counsel could not point out any perversity or substantive misreading or non-reading of evidence, this court does not find

any good ground to interfere with the concurrent findings of fact arrived at by the courts below.

The revision petition is dismissed.

October 01, 2018
nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

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