

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

Date of decision: 16.1.2019

1. **CR No.16413 of 2018(O&M)**
Ranjit SinghPetitioner

VERSUS

Sukhdip SinghRespondent

2. **CR No.16414 of 2018(O&M)**
Suresh KumarPetitioner

VERSUS

Sukhdip SinghRespondent

3. **CR No.16415 of 2018(O&M)**
Raman KumarPetitioner

VERSUS

Sukhdip SinghRespondent

4. **CR No.16416 of 2018(O&M)**
Harpal SinghPetitioner

VERSUS

Sukhdip SinghRespondent

5. **CR No.9261 of 2018(O&M)**
Jagdeep SinghPetitioner

VERSUS

Sukhdip SinghRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE REKHA MITTAL

Present: Mr. P.S. Jammu, Advocate for the petitioner
in CR Nos.16413 to 16416 of 2018.

Mr. BS. Bhalla, Advocate for the petitioner
in CR No.9261 of 2018.

Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate for the caveator.

REKHA MITTAL, J. (Oral)

This order will dispose of CR Nos.16413 to 16416 and 9261 of 2018 as identical questions of law and fact are involved for adjudication. For facility of reference, facts are taken from CR No.16413 of 2018.

Sukhdip Singh, respondent/landlord filed an application under Section 13-B of the East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, 1949 (in short 'the Act') for ejectment of the petitioner/respondent from shop marked ABCD, shown red in the site plan attached and a part of property marked as PQRSTU outlined as blue in the site plan comprising khasra No.530 situated on Amritsar road, in the area of Moga Mehla Singh –II, Moga. The petitioner/tenant filed application for leave to contest by invoking the provision of Section 18-A of the Act to which the respondent/landlord filed reply. Having heard counsel for the parties in the light of materials on record, the application for leave to contest was dismissed and the petitioner was directed to hand over possession of the tenanted premises to the respondent/landlord.

After arguing for some time, counsel representing the petitioners/tenants in the aforesaid five petitions would state that they do not press the petitions on merit but reasonable time may be allowed to the

petitioners to make arrangement of alternative accommodation and re-locate them.

Counsel for the respondent/caveator has got no objection.

In view of the above, the petitions stand disposed of. Order of eviction passed by the Rent Controller in five separate applications against different tenants by dismissing applications for leave to contest is affirmed subject, however, to the following conditions:-

1. The petitioner(s) shall vacate and hand over vacant possession of the tenancy premises to the respondent/landlord on or before 31.01.2020.
2. The petitioner(s) shall deposit arrears of rent up to 31.01.2020 within a period of three months by way of demand draft in the name of respondent/landlord, to be deposited with the Rent Controller, Moga.
3. The petitioner(s) shall furnish an undertaking before the Rent Controller, Moga within a period of 15 days from today that they shall hand over vacant possession of the tenancy premises on or before 31.01.2020.

Failure of the petitioner(s) to comply with either of the conditions would entitle the respondent to execute the eviction order forthwith.

Disposed of accordingly.

JANUARY 16, 2019

‘D. Gulati’

(REKHA MITTAL)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : yes/no

Whether reportable : yes/no