

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR-5913-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.09.2018

Anuradha Garg

--Petitioner

Versus

Amrik Lal

--Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. A.V.S. Barsat, Advocate for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J (Oral)

The instant revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of directions to the trial Court/Rent Controller Phul, District Bathinda to proceed further in the matter i.e. Rent application bearing CIS No.RA/1/17 dated 31.05.2017 titled as “Anuradha Garg Vs. Amrik Lal” and decide the same in an expeditious manner.

Counsel submits that the eviction petition had been preferred by the petitioner against the tenant/respondent on the ground of “bonafide personal necessity” and without there being any justifiable basis, proceedings are being deferred and an attempt has been made by the tenant to delay proceedings. Further urged that the petitioner/landlord is attending proceedings on each and every date and the entire evidence on behalf of the landlord has been led and now the matter is fixed for cross examination of the landlord for 27.09.2018.

Having heard counsel for the petitioner at length, this Court is of the view that no interference in the matter is warranted.

It has gone uncontroverted that the eviction petition was filed on 31.05.2017. Perusal of the zimini orders placed on record would reveal

that on 4-5 occasions proceedings had been deferred on account of strike call having been given by the Bar.

It is not a case where this Court may take a view that the proceedings have been deferred only to accommodate the tenant/respondent or that dilatory tactics have been adopted.

This Court does not find any basis/material to accept the prayer made in the petition.

Dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

06.09.2018

lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No