

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

CR-3336-2014(O&M)

Date of decision: 25.08.2022

State Bank of India & anr.

.... Petitioners

Versus

Sh. Sanjeev Banka

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Harshit Anand, Advocate, for
Mr. Aalok Jagga, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

None for the respondent.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J (Oral)

The petitioner herein is a bank. On 07.04.2009, the landlord sought eviction on the ground of bonafide necessity. The Rent Controller allowed petition on 02.11.2011. The appeal filed by the petitioners was dismissed on 22.03.2014. On 13.05.2014, notice of motion was issued as the learned counsel contended that the petition seeking eviction of the tenant could not be filed within the specific period agreed upon between the landlord and tenant. Thereafter, the revision petition remained pending for the last eight years.

Learned counsel representing the petitioners admits that the agreed period came to an end in the year 2011. The landlord cannot be non-suited at this stage on a technical ground. He has already litigated in the Courts for the last thirteen years. Even if the rent petition is deemed to have been filed after expiry of agreed period still more than 11 years have passed. The learned counsel did not press any other point. Hence, no ground for interference is made out.

Dismissed.

25.08.2022
monika

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

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