

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

121

CR No.217 of 2020

Date of decision : 14.01.2020.

Ranjit Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

Roshan Lal Bhatia

.. Respondent

CORAM :HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. A.P.S. Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has challenged the order of the appellate authority dated 18.12.2019 whereby the mesne profits have been assessed @ ₹4,500/- per month.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the property had been taken on rent by the petitioner in the year 1980 at a monthly rent of ₹300/- and the rent had been increased to ₹450/- per month in the year 2004 and therefore, the fixation of ₹ 4,500/- per month is highly excessive. He also contends that there was no cogent evidence which had been submitted by the respondent-landlord which would justify the impugned order.

Heard.

The respondent-landlord had preferred the petition for ejectment of the petitioner on account of arrears of rent and *bonafide* necessity. The petition had been allowed and the order was challenged before the appellate authority. In the impugned order, it has been noticed that the lease deed of the property in the area which was fetching monthly rent of ₹25,000/- had been placed on

record. The petitioner had also placed on record rent note of property which was taken on lease in the year 1980 @ ₹ 300/- per month and another rent note of the property taken on rent in the year 1997 which was fetching ₹ 1,435/- per month. The petitioner has been in occupation of the property for almost four decades. The monthly rent at that time was ₹ 300/- which had later been increased to ₹450/- in the year 2004. The premises in question are in Rambagh, Amritsar. The rent deed of a property in the area which had been rented out at a monthly rent of ₹25,000/- had been placed on record by the respondent-landlord. Therefore, the mesne profits assessed @ ₹4,500/- appear to be just and reasonable. Consequently, I do not find any manifest illegality in the impugned order which would warrant interference while exercising revisional jurisdiction.

The petition stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

January 14, 2020

sonia gugnani

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