



116

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR-7321-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision: 18.12.2024

Dev Raj @ Dev Raj Goel

...Petitioner

Versus

Umarjeet Singh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Lekh Raj Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sachmeet Singh Randhawa, Advocate and
Mr. Digvijay Singh Nehra, Advocate for the respondent.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Challenge in the present revision petition is to the order dated 30.09.2024 vide which an application filed by the respondent-landlord under Section 13-B of the East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, 1949 for ejectment of the petitioner from a shop in question, has been allowed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, during the course of arguments, has submitted that the petitioner would withdraw the present revision petition but has sought time to vacate the premises and to shift to another premises. It has been stated that the petitioner is a tenant in the premises since 1970.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the landlord has submitted that in case the petitioner wishes to continue in possession for some months then he should pay something more than the rent which he is liable to pay.

4. During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner



and learned counsel for the respondent, on instructions from their respective clients, have come to a common understanding that the petitioner be permitted to withdraw the present revision petition with the following directions:-

- i) The petitioner would vacate the premises and would hand over the keys of the premises to the respondent on or before 18.07.2025.
- ii) The petitioner would pay an amount of Rs.10,000/- per month from the month of December, 2024 up to the period the petitioner stays in occupation, on or before 25th of every month.
- iii) The petitioner would file an undertaking on the said two aspects before the Executing Court within a period of four weeks from today with an advance copy to counsel for the landlord in the Executing Court.

5. It is made clear that in case the petitioner does not submit the said undertaking or does not comply with any of the abovesaid conditions then it would be open to the respondent to seek immediate possession of the premises in question from the petitioner by applying for police help in addition to taking recourse to other proceedings including the Contempt of Courts Act.

6. In view of what has been observed above, the present revision petition is disposed of.

7. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of in view of the abovesaid order.

18.12.2024

Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No
Whether reportable:- Yes/No