



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No.2826 of 2023 (O&M)

Date of Order:24.03.2025

Rajinder Kapoor

.Petitioner

Versus

Vinod Dhanda

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Atul Goyal, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. A.P.Kaushal, Advocate, for the respondent.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, JUDGE (Oral)

1. The petitioner herein is a tenant, who has been ordered to be evicted on the ground of bonafide necessity by the Rent Controller which in appeal has been affirmed by the Appellate Authority.

2. The petitioner claimed the execution of the agreement to sell in his favour. He filed a separate suit for specific performance of the agreement to sell which has now been dismissed.

3. Both the courts have found that the landlord has a genuine bonafide personal necessity for settling his unemployed son.

4. The learned counsel representing the petitioner though made a sincere attempt, however, failed to draw the attention of the court to any perversity in the impugned judgment. The scope of interference in the revision petition against the concurrent order of eviction is extremely limited in view of the judgment passed by a five Judges Bench in **Hindustan**

Petroleum Corporation Ltd. vs. Dilbahar Singh(2014) 9 SCC 78.

5. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and discussion, no ground



to interfere is made out.

6. Dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

March 24, 2025
nt

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