



131

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR-2904-2026

Date of Decision: 06.04.2026

HORI LAL VYAS

..... Petitioner

Versus

DEEPAK JADON

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. B.K. Majoka, Advocate and
Ms. Mansi Majoka, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Jadon, respondent in person.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. This revision petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is directed against the order dated 07.03.2026 (Annexure P-5) passed by the learned District Judge, Faridabad, vide which the application filed by the petitioner for transfer of the eviction petition titled as "*Deepak Jadon Vs. Hori Lal Vyas*" bearing no. RP/164/2024 pending in the Court of Shri Sidharth Kapoor, learned Rent Controller, Faridabad, to any other court, has been dismissed.

2. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and respondent in person and have gone through the material placed on the file.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-tenant argued that the petitioner is a senior citizen, aged about 74 years and is suffering from various old age related diseases. It is further argued that the learned Rent Controller did not give any heed to the genuine requests



of the petitioner and imposed costs of Rs. 500/- upon him without any rhyme or reason. Learned counsel prayed that the petitioner has a reasonable apprehension that he will not get justice from the said court and the impugned order be set aside and case be transferred to some other Court.

4. Hon'ble Supreme Court while deciding Criminal Appeal Nos.1592- 1593 of 2015 titled ***Usmangani Adambhai Vs. State of Gujarat*** vide judgment dated 08.01.2016, has held that making callous allegations against the Judge is no ground to transfer the case from his Court and if it is done so, it will bring anarchy in the adjudicatory process and the unscrupulous litigants will indulge themselves in Court hunting. If they are allowed such room, they will not have to face the trial before a Court in which they do not feel comfortable. In (1991) 3 SCC 600, ***M. B. Sanghi Vs. High Court of Punjab & Haryana***, it has been observed that tendency of maligning the reputation of judicial officers by disgruntled elements, who fail to secure the desired order is ever on the increase and it is high time it is nipped in the bud. When there is a deliberate attempt to scandalize, which would shake the confidence of the litigating public in the system, the damage caused is not only to the reputation of the concerned judge but also to the fair name of the judiciary.

5. The record reveals that the landlord-respondent had instituted an eviction petition (RP/164/2024 titled "***Deepak Jadon Vs. Hori Lal Vyas***") on 04.10.2024 for eviction of tenant from the demised premises on the grounds of *bonafide* requirement and non-payment of rent. The petitioner-tenant filed an application for transfer of the said case on 03.02.2026. The learned District Judge, while dismissing the



application vide order dated 07.03.2026 and observed that the parties have already concluded their evidence and the case is fixed for final arguments. The learned District Court has come to the conclusion that the petitioner has already availed eight opportunities to address final arguments, which is fixed for arguments since 18.12.2025 and the transfer application has been filed merely to delay the proceedings.

6. In the present case also, there is nothing on the record to show that any bias has been exercised by the learned Presiding Officer against the petitioner. Vague allegations have been levelled that he will not get justice, without any substance to support the same and this is no ground to transfer an eviction petition to some other Court. If the cases are transferred on such flimsy grounds that the petitioner is a senior citizen and the Rent Controller did not give any heed to the request of the petitioner, then, it will be very easy for any party to seek transfer of the cases as per his own whims and fancies. The impugned order dated 07.03.2026 (Annexure P-5) passed by the learned District Judge, Faridabad, thus, does not suffer from any material illegality or manifest error which could call for interference.

7. Resultantly, the petition in hand is ordered to be dismissed.

8. Pending misc. application (s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

06.04.2026
Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No