

121

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

**C.R. No.722 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 04.09.2018**

Ram Sudhar

.....Petitioner

Versus

Som Parkash

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Dishan D. Tuteja, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.N.K. Bangar, Advocate
for the respondent.

ANIL KSHETARPAL J.(ORAL)

The tenant-petitioner is in the revision petition against the order passed by Rent Controller, affirmed by Appellate Authority, ordering his eviction. It is not disputed that landlord in execution of the decree for eviction has already taken over possession of the premises.

However, learned counsel for the petitioner-tenant submits that he has instructions to argue the revision petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that ingredients of Section 13 of the East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, have not been pleaded. He further submitted that various other petitions were filed by other family members which were dismissed. However, when learned counsel for the petitioner was asked to point out whether these points were ever pressed

before the Courts below, he failed to draw attention of the Court to the submissions made. In exercise of revisional jurisdiction, tenant-petitioner cannot be permitted to make submissions on the points which have not been pressed before both the Courts below. Hence, there is no ground to interfere.

Revision petition is dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of, in terms thereof.

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

September 04, 2018

shweta

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No