

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

CR No.920 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of decision : 10.09.2018

Kusum Lata and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Sonia and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Akshay Jindal, Advocate for the respondents.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (ORAL)

The landlords-petitioners are in the revision petition against the order passed by the Rent Controller dismissing their petition, affirmed in appeal by the Appellate Authority.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that he has instructions only to press this revision petition on the ground of personal necessity.

Learned Rent Controller has found that the landlords are owner of five other shops in the same building which are available to them for starting the business for their daughter.

It is not disputed that all these shops included the tenanted shops were constructed at one point of time and are part of same building.

Although, the Rent Controller has found that there are two

other shops at Bari Market, Model Town, Karnal for the time being, even if availability of those shops are ignored as the landlords have submitted that the aforesaid shops are in dilapidated condition, once five shops which are part of the same building are available, the bona fide requirement of the landlords is greed and not a bona fide necessity.

Hence, there is no ground to interfere.

Revision petition is dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are disposed of, in view of the abovesaid judgment.

10.09.2018

Pawan

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:- **Yes/No**

Whether reportable:- **Yes/No**