

Date of decision :24.04.2024

...Petitioner

...Respondent

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (Oral)

- NEERAJ
2024.04.27 02:28
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

Sh. Ashwani Kapoor and Sh. Satish Kumar. It came on the record that the petitioner had taken adjoining premises on rent and had shifted some of the furniture.

4. Thus, the trial Court came to the conclusion that the plaintiff has failed to prove forcible dispossession.

5. During the pendency of the revision petition, an application has been filed for permission to lead additional evidence. The petitioner wishes to produce certain photographs taken by the police of the premises showing that some goods belonging to the petitioner are lying in the premises.

5. This Court has considered the submissions of learned counsel representing the parties.

6. The petitioner appeared as PW-1. During the cross-examination, he admitted that he had shifted two Air Conditioners, furniture, computer etc. from SCO No. 43 to SCO No. 45, Sector 30, Chandigarh, whereas the rest of the furniture was lying in SCO No. 53, Sector 30-C, Chandigarh. Thus, it is obvious that conclusion drawn by the trial Court is not incorrect. Moreover, two neighbours, namely, Sh. Ashwani Kapoor and Sh. Satish Kumar have deposed before the trial Court that the petitioner voluntary handed over the possession of the premises.

7. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, the application for additional evidence as well as the revision petition filed by the petitioner are dismissed.

24.04.2024

neeraj

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Yes No
Yes No