

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Civil Revision No. 1622 of 2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 05.05.2022

M/s Vijay Fancy Store

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

Smt.Byasa Devi and Others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Mr. Kanwar Pahul Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. While assailing the concurrent orders, passed by the Rent Controller as well as the Appellate Authority, the tenant has filed the present revision petition. His eviction was sought on the ground of non-payment of rent as well as the bonafide necessity. It is claimed that the landlords are running a sweet shop from the premises owned by their uncle and now they want to shift to their own shop. Both the Courts below, as already noticed, have found that the requirement of the landlords is genuine.

2. Heard the learned counsel representing the petitioner, at length and with his able assistance, perused the paper-book.

3. The learned counsel representing the petitioner has, though, made sincere attempt, however, failed to draw the attention of the Court to any perversity or error in the judgment passed by both the Courts below.

The scope of revision under Section 15 of the East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, 1949 is limited. A reliance in this regard can be placed on

the five Judges Bench judgment of the Supreme Court in *Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited v. Dilbahar Singh (2014) 9 SCC 78*.

4. In view of the above, no ground is made out to interfere. Hence, the present revision petition is dismissed.

5. The miscellaneous application(s) pending, if any, shall stand disposed of.

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

May 05, 2022
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No