



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

Sr. No.136

CR-5762-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 29.07.2024

NEERAJ KUMAR

....Petitioner

Versus

USHA VERMA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ARCHANA PURI

Present:- Ms. Prarthana Duggal, Advocate, for
Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. S.P. Arora and Mr. Himanshu Arora, Advocates
for the respondent.

ARCHANA PURI, J. (Oral)

At this stage, learned counsel for the respondent submits that, even though, the affidavit, copy whereof is Annexure P-3, was proved in evidence in the testimony of Usha Verma-respondent, while she made appearance as PW-1, as Ex.A-4, but however, he will not rely upon this affidavit, for any purposes, before learned Trial Court, as the ejectment petition has been filed by the respondent, on the ground of 'personal necessity'. Thus, for all intents and purposes, the affidavit (Annexure P-3), may be considered as non-existent for deciding the controversy before learned Trial Court.

In the given circumstances, learned counsel making appearance on behalf of the petitioner has given a statement that in view of the statement given by learned counsel for the respondent, she does not want to pursue with the present revision petition and the same may be dismissed as withdrawn.



Ordered accordingly.

However, the respondent shall remain bound by the statement made by the counsel in the Court today and for all intents and purposes, the affidavit, copy whereof is Annexure P-3, shall be considered as non-existent and shall not be made basis for any relief, to be granted, to either of the parties, in the ejectment petition, pending before the Rent Controller.

29.07.2024
Himanshu

(ARCHANA PURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : Yes/No