

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

**T.A. No.456 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : January 19, 2018**

Surjit Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Tej Pal Singh Ahluwalia

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Vivek K. Thakur, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. D.S. Sandhu, Advocate for the respondent.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Heard.

Petitioner seeks transfer of Rent Petition No.7, titled as “*Tej Pal Singh Ahluwalia vs Surjit Singh*” pending since 15.04.2015 in the Court of Shri Sumit Makkar, learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kapurthala to any other court situated in the State of Punjab other than District Kapurthala on the ground that the landlord in the said case is practicing as an Advocate at District Courts, Kapurthala and he has apprehension that he will not get justice from the courts at Kapurthala.

I am of the view that the case is pending since April 2015 and for all the years, the present petitioner had no apprehension. Now, the evidence is complete and the case is stated to be fixed for arguments. When the present petition was filed, the case was fixed for evidence of the respondents, in which he was granted several opportunities.

I am again of the view that the apprehension of the present petitioner is unfounded. It cannot be accepted that Judicial Officer will be

influenced by the fact that the landlord is practicing as an Advocate at District Courts, Kaputhala. The Judicial Officer is supposed to take an independent view in the matter, irrespective the status of the parties.

Thus, there is no ground to transfer the aforesaid petition. As such, the present petition is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

January 19, 2018

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No