


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

106

2025.PHHC:010687



**CR-438-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision: 24.01.2025**

DIYAL CHAND

..Petitioner

Versus

RAVINDER KUMAR

..Respondent


CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. A.P.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Kataria, Advocate
Mr. Abhishek Satija, Advocate
Ms. Sunita Punia, Advocate
for respondent.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

1. The petitioner herein is a tenant, who has been ordered to be evicted on the ground of bonafide necessity of the landlord by the Rent Controller, which has been affirmed by the Appellate Authority.
2. This Bench has heard the learned counsel representing the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the paperbook.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petition was liable to be dismissed as the petitioner had concealed that he was the owner of another shop located in different locality. He submits that the concealment of material facts should entail dismissal of the eviction petition.
4. This Court has considered the submissions of learned counsel representing the parties.
5. It is the case of the landlord that he wants to construct a big showroom in order to settle his unemployed son. As per the requirement of the act, the landlord is required to disclose similar property in his possession.



However, the counsel failed to draw the attention of the Court to any such property. Moreover, at the stage of revision, the Court is not expected to entertain a new objection, which was never taken up before the Courts below.

- 6. Hence, no ground to interfere is made out.
- 7. Dismissed accordingly.
- 8. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

January 24th, 2025

Ay

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

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