

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

C.R. No.6893 of 2017

Date of Decision.28.03.2018

Parveen Kumar

.....Petitioner

Vs

Khushi Malik and another

.....Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. Madan Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

-.-

AMIT RAWAL J.(ORAL)

The petitioner-Parveen Kumar is aggrieved of the impugned order dated 13.09.2017 whereby the objections to the judgment and decree passed by the Rent Controller were filed on the premise that he was inducted as tenant by respondent No.2-judgment debtor. The aforementioned objections have been dismissed on the ground that there was no contract of rent between Khushi Malik, landlord and the petitioner-objector.

Mr. Sandhu, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the rent agreement had also expired on 14.11.2017.

In view of the aforementioned fact, the objection of the petitioner has become redundant, for, the period disputed is over. Moreover, it has not been established on record that there was tenancy between the landlord/decreed holder Khushi Malik and the petitioner.

The order under challenge, in my view, does not suffer from any illegality and perversity, much less, cannot be said to be passed without jurisdiction. No ground for interference is made out. Resultantly, the revision petition stands dismissed.

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

March 28, 2018

Pankaj*

Whether reasoned/speaking Yes

Whether reportable No