

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

115

RA-CR-1240-CII-2018 in
CR No.2567 of 2007

Date of decision: 17.01.2019

P.S. Chatwal

..... Petitioner

Versus

Sardari Lal

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present:- Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. T.S. Khaira, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioner.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (ORAL)

The review of judgment passed while affirming the concurrent findings of the Rent Controller and the Appellate Authority is sought.

Learned counsel for the review-applicant has pointed out that the Appellate Authority has referred to the report of the Local Commissioner who visited the spot and has recorded that he inquired from four persons whereas in the report, name of only one person has been given and three other shops have been referred to by their trade name. All the shops were manned by someone, therefore, the Appellate Authority has referred to the inquiry by the Local Commissioner from four persons. Still further, this point was never pressed in the revision petition. While deciding a revision, this Court has a very limited jurisdiction. This Court had heard learned senior counsel who had appeared and have given detailed

judgment supported by reasons. The scope of review is limited and the evidence cannot be permitted to be re-appreciated.

Hence, review application is dismissed.

No order is required to be passed in miscellaneous application (CM-27446-CII-2018) for condoning the delay.

17.01.2019
Dinesh Bansal

**(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No