

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

109

**CR-4014 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 28.10.2022**

Amar Dass Khullar

..Petitioner

Versus

Gurminder Singh Kahlon

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Harminder Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Swati Verma Simble, Advocate,
for respondent no.2.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

On 25.04.2022, after hearing the learned counsel representing
the petitioner, the following order was passed:-

*“The learned counsel representing the petitioner
contends that the respondent-landlord lost his ownership
itself before the date of order of eviction passed by the
Rent Controller in his favour. He contends that in a suit
for specific performance of the agreement to sell filed by
Rakesh Soni, a decree has been passed on 13.12.2016
and the same was placed on the file before the Rent
Controller, however, not adverted to.*

Notice of motion for 27.05.2022.

To be listed in urgent.”

It may be noted here that the Rent Controller has ordered
eviction of the petitioner on the ground of bonafide personal necessity of the
landlord. Admittedly, the landlord is no longer the owner of the property.
The tenant has already attorned in favour of the new owner, namely,
respondent no.2. Hence, relationship of the previous landlord and the tenant
has come to an end.

The learned counsel representing respondent no.2 admits that
the petitioner is paying rent to respondent no.2. She further submits that she
is not interested in prosecuting the eviction petition against the petitioner.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, the revision petition is disposed of by observing that the order of eviction, passed by the Rent Controller in favour of respondent no.1, shall stand infructuous and hence, not implementable/executable.

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

October 28, 2022
nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

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