

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

Date of Decision : 12.3.2018

106 CR-8779-2017 (O&M)

Rakesh Mittal

....Appellant

VS

M/s. Ally Venture & Company and others

....Respondents

106-A CR-8781-2017 (O&M)

Rakesh Mittal

....Appellant

VS

M/s. Ally Venture & Company and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr.K.K.Garg, Advocate
for the appellant.

AJAY TEWARI, J.(Oral)

This order shall dispose of the aforesaid two civil revisions as common questions of law and facts are involved therein.

These two petitions have been filed against the order of the District Judge declining to transfer rent petitions from the Court of Sh. Varun Nagpal, PCS, Rent Controller, Bathinda to any other Court.

The ground taken by the learned counsel for the petitioner was that the respondent-landlord was openly proclaiming that he had access to the judicial officer and this was also clear from the fact that when the officer dismissed an application under Order 6 Rule 17 he did not give

the petitioner even time to challenge that order. Learned District Judge found that the case was one of the action plan cases which is pending for four years at the behest of the petitioner-tenant. It is further noticed that a mere allegation that one party proclaiming proximity cannot be a ground for transfer. Learned counsel is not in a position to explain how these findings are wrong.

Consequently, both the petitions are dismissed.

Since the main cases have been decided, the pending C.M, if any, also stand disposed of.

12.3.2018
anuradha

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned - Yes/No

Whether reportable - Yes/No