

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

113

**CR-2141-2021(O&M)
Date of decision:29.09.2021**

VINOD KUMAR

...Petitioner

Versus

NARESH KUMARI

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

**Present: Mr. Vishal Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.**

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J (Oral)

The hearing of the case was held through video conferencing on account of restricted functioning of the Courts.

The Petitioner (tenant) has filed the present revision petition while assailing the correctness of the order passed by the learned Rent Controller, on 18.08.2021.

The petitioner (tenant) filed an application for rejecting the eviction petition on the ground that the petition has been filed under the East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, 1949, whereas it should have been filed under the Punjab Rent Act, 1995. The learned Rent Controller has observed that the petition cannot be dismissed merely on the ground that the nomenclature of the petition has been wrongly stated.

The eviction of the petitioner has been sought on the ground of non-payment of rent and bonafide requirement of the landlord. Both the grounds are available in the Punjab Rent Act, 1995, as well. The petitioner has failed to show any prejudice.

Hence, no ground to interfere.

Dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

September 29, 2021
nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No