



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

CR-8802-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 08.12.2025

ROSHAN LAL (SINCE DECEASED) THROUGH HIS LRS

....Petitioner

Versus

AMARJIT SINGH AND OTHERS

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL

Present: Mr. Varinder Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Parmod Goyal, J. (Oral)

Petitioner/tenants are aggrieved by impugned order of eviction passed by learned Rent Controller, Chandigarh vide judgment dated 30.01.2023 as well as judgment passed by learned Appellate Authority dated 31.10.2025, whereby appeal preferred by tenants was dismissed and eviction order was upheld.

2. Respondent No.1/landlord had preferred an eviction petition against petitioner/tenants on the ground of non-payment of rent and personal necessity. Both the Courts below have found the grounds taken by respondent/landlord to be just grounds for eviction and ordered eviction. It has also been found by the Courts below that petitioner/tenants are in arrears of rent and suit property is required by respondent/landlord for settlement of his married/daughter.

3. The main ground of attack to the impugned judgments is based



upon a complaint made by Niranjana Kaur to SSP, Chandigarh whereby she had claimed that she has never issued general power of attorney in favour of one Darshan Singh and Mona Singh regarding the suit property and who had sold the same to the respondent/landlord.

4. It is the case of petitioner/tenants that suit property was never authorized to be sold by original landlady who had given premises to father of petitioner namely Roshan Lal. Admittedly, Niranjana Kaur was the original owner of suit property and one Darshan Singh and Mona Singh claimed to be her power of attorney holders. It is also not disputed that Darshan Singh and Mona Singh had entered into an agreement to sell in favour of respondent No.1/landlord and subsequently sale deed was also executed through Court in favour of respondent/landlord.

5. It is worth noting and fairly admitted by learned counsel for petitioner/tenants that except for filing complaint before SSP upon which FIR was lodged, no other steps were taken by Niranjana Kaur.

6. Learned counsel for petitioner/tenants has also relied upon Letter dated 28.10.2021 marked R2/A, to Estate Officer whereby Niranjana Kaur had made a complaint against transfer deed and claimed to be owner of House No.1670, Sector 22-B, Chandigarh. It is worth noticing that complaint made by Niranjana Kaur was made on 09.06.1995 and thereafter, she had never taken any logical steps challenging the agreement to sell and general power of attorney of transfer deed by filing any declaration suit before any Court of law. The sale deed in favour of respondent/landlord has therefore attained finality as it was not challenged by Niranjana Kaur, who



alone could have challenged the same.

7. In these circumstances, it is not open for petitioner/tenants to claim suit property through Niranjana Kaur. It is Niranjana Kaur who could have sought setting aside of general power of attorney in favour of Darshan Singh and Mona Singh and sale deed in favour of respondent/landlord which has not been done by her. In these circumstances, entitlement of respondent No.1 in the present proceedings cannot be challenged.

8. Faced with this, learned counsel for petitioner/tenants has argued that need of respondent/landlord is not *bona fide* as he is seeking to settle her married daughter, however, I do not find any merit in the contention raised on behalf of petitioner/tenants. A landlord is within his right to settle his married or unmarried daughters/sons as per his/her requirement and wishes. The right of landlord i.e. manner in which suit property owned by him is required to be used cannot be challenged by a tenant.

9. I do not find any error in appreciation of evidence by Courts below. The conclusion drawn by learned Courts below is based upon pleadings and evidence of the present case. Accordingly, present revision petition is dismissed.

08.12.2025
chiranjeev

(PARMOD GOYAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No