

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

123

CR-727-2022 (O&M)

DATE OF DECISION: 04.03.2022

BSNL AND OTHERS

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

JAGDISH RAI

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. D.R. Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners have challenged the order/judgment dated 13.07.2018 of the Rent Controller, Sirsa whereby the petition preferred by the respondent under Section 13 of the Haryana Urban (Control of Rent & Eviction) Act, 1973 for eviction of the petitioners from the premises has been allowed as well as the order dated 25.10.2021 passed by the appellate authority whereby the appeal preferred by the appellants thereagainst has been dismissed.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners had set up a tower on the premises which was taken on lease in the year 2005. The lease was extended for a period of 5 years and the rent was also enhanced. He also submits that the respondent could not set up a case for personal necessity and the petition ought to have been dismissed.

Heard.

The respondent had filed a petition for eviction on the ground of personal necessity. He had pleaded that the premises are required for his younger son who is to set up his business and is unemployed. The respondent had appeared before the Rent Controller as PW-1 and had deposed in support

of his case. The son of petitioner had also appeared as PW-2 and had produced project report Exhibit PW-10/A prepared by the Chartered Accountant for setting up of his business. The Chartered Accountant also appeared as PW-3 and proved his report. It is, thus, apparent that the respondents had been able to make out a case for eviction of the petitioner on account of personal necessity.

Consequently, I do not find any merit in the instant petition which stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

04.03.2022

SwarnjitS

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