

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

RSA-281-2020(O&M)

Date of decision:-15.12.2021

Satya Devi

...Appellant/Defendant

Versus

Rajinder Kumar

...Respondent/Plaintiff

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE H.S.MADAAN

Present: Mr.R.L. Mittal, Advocate
for the appellant (Legal Aid Counsel).

H.S. MADAAN, J.(ORAL)

Both the Courts below considering the factual position and the law on the subject have returned concurrent findings that the possession of Satya Devi defendant in the civil suit, who is appellant before this Court has been that of a licensee under plaintiff Rajinder Kumar, who is respondent in the present appeal and the latter being owner of the property in question has since terminated licence of the former, as such the latter is entitled to get possession of the property in question from Satya Devi.

After hearing learned counsel for the appellant and going through the record, I find that the judgments delivered by the trial Court of Civil Judge (Jr.Divn.), Chandigarh and First Appellate Court of Additional District Judge, Chandigarh are detailed and well reasoned and

I do not find any such illegality or infirmity with the impugned judgments passed by the Courts below much less apparent on the face of those. I do not see any reason to upset the impugned judgments.

No substantial question of law arises in this appeal. Therefore, the present regular second appeal filed by defendant/appellant Satya Devi is found to be without any merit and is dismissed accordingly.

15.12.2021
Brij

(H.S.MADAAN)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No