

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

113

2025:PHHC:029407



**CM-14367-CII-2024
CM-14368-CII-2024 in/and
CR-5338-2015
Date of decision: 03.03.2025**

SATNAM SINGH

..Petitioner

Versus

KISHAN CHAND (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS. ..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. V.K. Sandhir, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Prateek Sodhi, Advocate
Ms. Jasmine, Advocate
for respondent.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

1. With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, the revision petition is taken on board for final disposal today itself.

2. The petitioner herein is a tenant, who has been ordered to be evicted by the Rent Controller, which in appeal has been affirmed by the Appellate Authority.

2. Admittedly, the landowner is owner of three shops. He has three sons. One son is Sh. Mukesh, who is occupying an independent shop, whereas, second son Sh. Rakesh occupies another shop independently. The landlord wants third shop, which is in the possession of the petitioner for settling Sh. Rajinder, his third son.

4. The petition was filed in the year 2012. Both the Courts have correctly appreciated the evidence and there is no misreading.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner challenges the correctness of findings on the ground that in the cross-examination the tenant and his son



has admitted the availability of another shop, however, such one sentence in the statement cannot be read in isolation. The oral depositions have to be read comprehensively to come to a conclusion.

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

March 03rd, 2025
Ayub

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

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