

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Civil Revision No. 2945 of 2021 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 10.02.2022

Darshan Kumar

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

Meena Rani

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anil Kshetarpal.

Present: Ms. Shivya Sehgal Advocate
for Mr. Gobind Singh Randhawa, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Anil Kshetarpal, J.

1. The petitioner is a tenant, who is defending the eviction petition, filed by the respondent, under Section 13 of the East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, Act-III of 1949.

2. The petition was filed in the year 2016. After a period of five years, an application for permission to amend the written statement was filed, which was dismissed by the Rent Controller while observing that the assertions, which are proposed to be added in the amended written statement, are the matter of evidence and the tenant can very well prove those facts at the time of evidence.

3. The learned counsel representing the petitioner contends that the petitioner wishes to aver about the subsequent events. It is noted here that the tenant has already filed a detailed written statement alleging that the requirement of the landlady is not bonafide. Once the Rent Controller has

already observed that the petitioner can very well prove those facts at the

time of the evidence, no ground to interfere is made out. Consequently, the present revision petition is dismissed.

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

(Anil Kshetarpal)
Judge

February 10, 2022
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No