

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.16186 of 2018(O&M)

Date of Decision:19.7.2018

Vicky Sidana and another

... Petitioners

Versus

Sudesh Kumari and others

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr.Vikram Anand, Advocate for the petitioners

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr.Manuj Nagrath,Advocate who is present in Court watching the proceedings and has appeared for respondent no.1 on Memorandum of Appearance.

The petitioners and the respondents are at loggerheads. There is civil litigation pending between the father and the son. The father re-claimed his shop from the son and the litigation is pending on that account as well. Petitioner no.2 is the wife of petitioner no.1 and they are involved in domestic violence proceedings. The ownership of the property beyond doubt is with the respondent-mother. If the parents are convinced that it would not subserve common interest, then they are within their right to seek eviction of the petitioners. The Deputy Commissioner-cum-District Magistrate, Jalandhar has, by a reasoned order dated 18.4.2018, directed the petitioners to vacate the premises. I find no infirmity in the impugned order.

In view of the above, I find no merit in this petition and the same is dismissed *in limine*.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

19.7.2018
MFK

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No