

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

Sr.No.118

**CR No.969 of 2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 17.03.2022**

Ranjeet Singh @ Davinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Sandeep Kaur and others

...Respondents

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present: Mr. L.M. Gulati, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.

The petitioner herein assails the order dated 15.03.2022 passed by learned Additional District Judge, Chandigarh, whereby the tender/payment of the admitted arrears of rent amounting to Rs.18 lac, has been set as a condition precedent for staying the order dated 02.03.2022 passed by the Rent Controller qua the tender of provisionally assessed rent by him on 16.03.2022.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner in the present revision petition and have also perused the file carefully.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is facing financial problems and therefore, he is not in a position to arrange for the huge amount of Rs.18 lac within such a short period given to him for tendering the same before the Rent Controller and hence, the impugned order deserves to be at least modified by extending the period for tendering the said amount.

.....

However, this contention is devoid of any merit because vide the order dated 02.03.2022, the Rent Controller has provisionally assessed the arrears of rent qua the property in dispute @ Rs.1.25 lac per month which came out to be Rs.68.95 lac. The petitioner preferred the appeal against the said order and the Appellate Court has passed the impugned order in the same directing him to tender/pay the arrears of rent on 16.03.2022 at the rate as admitted by him, i.e Rs.60,000/- per month, which have been calculated to be Rs.18 lac. This fact itself shows that the present revision petition has become infructuous. Moreover, the prayer of the petitioner for extension of time even for tendering the amount of arrears of rent at the said admitted rate, is not justified at all as he has been enjoying the user of the property in question during the relevant period.

As a sequel to the fore-going discussion, it follows that there is no illegality, irregularity, perversity or infirmity in the impugned order so as to warrant any interference by this Court. Resultantly, the revision petition in hand, being *sans* any merit, stands dismissed.

17.03.2022
neetu

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>No</i>