



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR-2017-2025(O&M)
Date of decision : 01.04.2025

Rajeev Talwar

... Petitioner

Versus

Ranjeev Jain @ Rajeev Jain

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr.Sidhant Vermani, Advocate
for the petitioner.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

1. This is a Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the order dated 06.02.2025 (Annexure P-5), vide which the application filed by the petitioner-tenant seeking directions to the landlord for permitting one Rohit Sharma, Civil Engineer to get proper inspection of the demised premises and to get a proper survey, has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is satisfied with the impugned order, inasmuch as, as per the order dated 06.02.2025, the Rent Controller had observed that the petitioner-tenant can get the portion of the building under his possession surveyed without even seeking permission of the Court and had only disallowed the survey of the whole building which is not in possession of the petitioner. It



is submitted that the petitioner only wishes to get the portion of the building under his own possession surveyed but has submitted that as per his instructions, the respondent-landlord is not even permitting the Civil Engineer to get the survey of the portion of the building under the petitioner's possession.

3. A perusal of the application dated 06.05.2024 (Annexure P-3) as well as the revision petition would show that no specific date on which the landlord did not permit the petitioner or the Civil Engineer to carry out the survey of the premises which is under his possession, has been mentioned.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, in view of the above, seeks to withdraw the present petition with liberty to file an appropriate application before the Rent Controller mentioning the abovesaid details.

5. In view of the statement made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the present petition is dismissed as withdrawn with the aforesaid liberty.

6. It is made clear that this Court has not opined on the merits, maintainability or otherwise of any such application which the petitioner wishes to file.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

April 01, 2025.

Davinder Kumar

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No