


2024:PHHC:088554



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

127 (A)

CR-3902-2024

Date of Decision.:16.07.2024

Pankaj Kumar Sachdeva

Petitioner

Vs.

Sandeep Kaur

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA


Present: Mr. G.S. Bhatia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

By way of this revision, petitioner challenges the order dated 05.07.2024 (Annexure P-11) passed by learned Rent Controller, Amritsar in a rent petition titled "Sandeep Kaur v. Pankaj Kumar Sachdeva", whereby an application under Order VI Rule 17 CPC for amendment of the written statement has been declined.

2. The petitioner was the respondent i.e. tenant before the Rent Controller.

3. By way of the application (Annexure P-9) moved under Order VI Rule 17 CPC the petitioner wanted to raise the objection that demised premises are residential building and that same cannot be got vacated for converting it into the commercial one without seeking permission from the competent authority.



4. Perusal of the impugned order would reveal that issue No.3 regarding maintainability of the petition has already been framed. Learned Rent Controller has further observed that additional preliminary objection, which the tenant want to raise, can well be considered under issue No.3 itself and therefore, there was no necessity for amendment of the written statement.

5. This Court does not find any illegality in the impugned order as the preliminary objection which the petitioner- tenant wants to raise shall be considered under issue No.3 as has been observed by Rent Controller.

Dismissed.

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

July 16, 2024
Neetika Tuteja

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No