

[CR-3594-2026](#)

- 1 -

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

119

[CR-3594-2026](#)**Date of decision: 29.04.2026****BHARAT BHUSHAN @ BUNTY****....Petitioner****Versus****MINAKSHI BHATIA AND OTHERS****...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR**

Present : Mr. S.S. Sarwara, Advocate,
Mr. Sanjay Khan, Advocate and
Mr. K.V.S. Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR. J.(Oral)

1. This revision petition is directed against the order dated 22.04.2026 (Annexure P-1), vide which the application moved by the petitioner-tenant seeking extension of time to deposit the mesne profits has been rejected by the Appellate Court.
2. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the material placed on the file.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that vide judgment dated 26.07.2024, the Rent Controller had ordered the eviction of the present petitioner from the demised premises and against the said judgment, he had instituted an appeal and the appellate authority vide order dated 01.05.2025 had assessed mesne profits @ Rs.7500/- per month which were ordered to be paid with effect from 26.07.2024 onwards within a period of 60 days. It was further ordered that appellant-petitioner shall keep on paying the mesne profits at the same rate on or before 10th day of every month during pendency of the appeal and in case of his



CR-3594-2026

- 2-

failure to do so, the stay shall stand vacated automatically. Learned counsel further contended that petitioner had been approaching the landlord/respondent to accept the mesne profits but he kept on prolonging the matter and as such, the mesne profits could not be paid in time and the learned Appellate Court ought to have extended the time to deposit the mesne profits particularly because the appeal is still pending and he prayed that the impugned order dated 08.04.2026 be set aside.

4. However, I do not find any force in the contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Petitioner was ordered to be evicted from the demised premises in a petition under Section 13 of the East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, 1949, instituted by the respondent-landlord vide order dated 26.07.2024. Against the said order, petitioner preferred an appeal and operation of the eviction order was stayed conditionally and the following order was passed:-

“With the observations, both the applications i.e. one filed by appellant/tenant for staying the operation of eviction order dated 26.7.2024 and the another application filed by respondent no.1/landlord for assessment of mesne profit stands allowed. As the disposal of the present appeal shall take sufficient long time and in order to avoid multiplicity of the proceedings and considering the fact that if the operation of order dated 26.7.2024 is not stayed and the possession is taken by respondent no.1 from the appellant during the pendency of present appeal, then the purpose of filing the present appeal will be frustrated, so, the proceeding before the Executing Court on the basis of eviction order dated 26.7.2024 will remained stayed during the pendency of present appeal, subject to the payment of arrears of mesne profit in the Executing Court at the rate of Rs.7500/- per month by the appellant to respondent no.1 w.e.f. 26.7.2024 till date, within 60 days from the date of this order. He shall further keep on paying the mesne profit at the rate of



CR-3594-2026

- 3-

Rs.7500/- per month to respondent no.1 till 10th of every month during the pendency of present appeal. However, it is made clear that if the appellant/ tenant fails to pay the arrears of mesne profit within 60 days and future mesne profit on or before the 10th day of any month then the stay will stand automatically vacated.”

6. Now, as per version of petitioner, he had deposited the mesne profits up to 28.02.2025 but thereafter, landlord had not accepted the same and he kept on prolonging the matter and a prayer was made to allow him to deposit the mesne profits by extending the time. However, in my considered opinion, the petitioner had been negligent and did not comply with the directions issued by the Appellate Court. Initially, he had deposited the mesne profits in the Treasury and what prevented him from again depositing the future mesne profits in the Treasury or in the bank account of the landlord has not been explained. The plea that respondent-landlord had not accepted the amount has been raised only to save his own skin and he miserably failed to deposit the mesne profits from November 2025 onwards and thereafter, moved the application on 10.02.2026 seeking extension of time. The learned Appellate Court has thus rightly rejected the application taking into consideration the conduct of the petitioner and no interference in the impugned order is called for.

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

29.04.2026
amandeep

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No