



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(127)

CR No. 2310 of 2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 11.03.2026

Vipin Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

Mukesh Mehndiratta and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. D.S. Matya, Advocate for the petitioner.

Amarinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

CM-5115-CII-2026

Application is allowed, as prayed for.

CR-2310-2026 (O&M)

1. The present civil revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, 1950 for setting-aside the impugned order dated 11.11.2025 (Annexure P-14) passed by learned Rent Controller, Ambala, whereby the application filed by the petitioner under Order XI Rule 14 CPC for production of documents was dismissed.

2. Record would reveal that respondent-petitioners Mukesh Mehndiratta and another had filed a petition under Section 13 of the Haryana Urban (Control of Rent & Eviction) Act No. 11 of 1973 for ejectment of the petitioner-respondent from Shop No. 7568/4, Bans Bazar, Ambala City on the ground of arrears of rent and personal necessity etc. Upon notice of the petition, the present petitioner appeared and filed the written statement.



3. During the pendency of the ejectment petition, the present petitioner moved an application under Order XI Rule 14 read with Section 151 CPC seeking directions to the respondents to produce original documents of ownership in respect of the properties situated at Ambala. Notice of the said application was issued and the respondents filed their reply. The learned Rent Controller, Ambala, after hearing respective counsel for the parties, dismissed the said application vide order dated 11.11.2025, which order is under challenge in the present petition.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the respondents have concealed material facts to the effect that a shop in the building in question was earlier let out to a beauty parlour namely, 'Silky Makeover' and thereafter to an Eye Hospital, 'Shivaay Eye Hospital'. Learned counsel has further contended that the rent notes of the above said shops are in possession of the respondents and the same are necessary for the proper adjudication of the ejectment petition.

5. It has further been contended that the rent notes of the adjoining shops should be produced before the learned Rent Controller for the proper adjudication of the case but the learned Rent Controller simply dismissed the application by not appreciating the fact that the rent notes of the adjoining shops which are in possession of the respondents, should be produced for the proper adjudication of the case. Rather, the respondents have concealed regarding the let out of the shop by the respondents earlier to a beauty parlour, namely, 'Silky Makeover' and after getting vacated the same, had let out the same to an Eye Hospital, 'Shivaay Eye Hospital'. Thus, the prayer



was made that the order dated 11.11.2025 be set-aside and the respondents be directed to produce the rent notes of the above mentioned shop.

6. In view of the order proposed to be passed, notice is not being issued to the respondent as it would unnecessarily delay the proceedings and also entail additional expenses for the respondents.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the record.

8. A perusal of the rent petition would show that in paragraph 3, the petitioners/landlords have submitted that the father of the petitioners died on 05.04.2021 and the petitioners succeeded to the premises by way of a Registered Will executed by their father Sh. Krishan Lal and that the present petitioner had become tenant under the present respondents at a monthly rent of ₹4,000/- besides electricity charges.

9. In the written statement, the present petitioner has not disputed the relationship of landlord and tenant and has merely stated that the same is a matter of record to be proved by the present respondents, however, it is denied that the rate of rent of the shop in question is ₹4,000/- per month.

10. Once, the tenancy has not been disputed by the present petitioner, the production of rent notes relating to other shops allegedly let out by the present respondents to an Eye Hospital, is not relevant for adjudication of the ejectment petition pending before the learned Rent Controller.

11. In the present case, the learned Rent Controller has rightly concluded that the present petitioner cannot compel the present respondents to produce documents, which are not necessary for deciding the controversy



in the ejectment petition. The documents sought to be produced pertain to alleged tenancy of adjoining shops and do not have any direct bearing on the dispute between the parties regarding the shop in question. Rather, the application appears to have been filed only to delay the proceedings before the learned Rent Controller.

12. In view of the above, no interference is called for by this Court in the impugned order dated 11.11.2025 passed by learned Rent Controller, Ambala.

13. Accordingly, the present civil revision petition is dismissed.

14. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

March 11, 2026
kanchan

(AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No