



RSA-1431-2024 (O&M)

1

**141 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****RSA-1431-2024 (O&M)**

Date of decision: 22.05.2024

Tarlok Singh (since deceased) through his LR Khushpreet Singh

....Appellant

Versus

Jatinder Pal (since deceased) through his LR son Raj Kumar

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present:- Sh.Khushpreet Singh, appellant in person

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J (Oral)

1. The appellant appears in person. He has filed Regular Second Appeal against the concurrent orders passed by the Rent Controller, which in appeal has been upheld by the appellate authority, while ordering his eviction. The Regular Second Appeal is not maintainable because the impugned orders are revisable under Section 15 of the East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, 1949. Hence, this appeal is ordered to be treated as revision petition. The office is directed to re-number the present appeal as civil revision.

2. The petitioner contends that the landlord is the owner of as many as three shops. He submits that two shops are in the front of his house whereas the third one is located in Andaruni Bazaar. Both the authorities have examined this aspect and found that the shop located in Andaruni Bazaar is in the possession of petitioner's son, who is running his gold jewellery business. The respondent is running a steel furniture



shop, however, now he wants to open a big showroom of diamond and gold jewellery in order to expand his business and settle his grandson, who has become major. Both the courts have already appreciated this fact. The scope of interference in the rent revision petition is limited in view of the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in **Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited vs. Dilbahar Singh' (2014) 9 SCC 78.**

3. Though, the learned counsel representing the petitioner made sincere attempt, however, failed to draw the attention of the Court to any error in appreciation of evidence or perversity in the impugned orders.

4. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, no ground to interfere is made out.

5. Hence, dismissed.

6. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

22.05.2024
rekha
Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE