



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

Civil Revision No.3539 of 2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 02.07.2024

Goyal Agencies through its Proprietor
(since deceased) through LRs

...Revisionist-Petitioner

Versus

Vipul Mittar Sood

...Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Vikas Kuthiala, Advocate,
for the LRs of the petitioner.

Mr. Nakul Sharma, Advocate,
for the respondent-Caveator.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)

At the very outset, learned counsel for the LRs of the proprietor of the petitioner-tenant Firm submits that he does not press for the adjudication of the instant revision-petition on merits and he, rather, prays for grant of time to his clients up to 31.01.2025 to vacate the demised shop and he also undertakes on their (clients') behalf that they shall vacate the same, by the afore-mentioned date.

Learned counsel for the respondent-Caveator-landlord has no objection to the above-discussed submission as well as the prayer, made by learned counsel for the LRs of the proprietor of the petitioner-Firm.

Resultantly, the revision-petition in hand stands dismissed as having not been pressed, with the directions to the LRs of the proprietor of



the petitioner-Firm to vacate the demised shop up to 31.01.2025 positively and also to pay the *mesne-profits* to the respondent-landlord, at the agreed rate of rent, regularly during this period. It is further clarified that in case of any default on the part of the LRs of the proprietor of the petitioner-Firm in vacating the demised shop till the afore-stipulated date or in the payment of the *mesne-profits*, the respondent-landlord shall be at liberty to resort to the appropriate remedy, as may be permissible to him, in such eventuality.

July 02, 2024
seema

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether Reportable: No