

*IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB
AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.*

C.R. No. 5686 of 2009. [O&M]

Date of Decision: 26th October, 2009.

Harbeer Singh

Petitioner
through
Mr. Hemant Saini, Advocate

Versus

Madan Lal Rambani & Ors.

Respondents

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT.

- 1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?***
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?***
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?***

SURYA KANT, J. [ORAL]

The petitioner – tenant is aggrieved at the order dated 7.09.2009 passed by the Rent Controller, Amritsar, whereby due to non-appearance of a witness, who was allowed to be produced in the additional evidence, the petitioner's evidence has been closed by court-orders.

Notice of motion was issued. It is stated by counsel for the petitioner that whereas, respondent No. 1 has expired, respondent No. 2 has been served through affixation and respondents No. 3 to 6 have refused to accept the notice, it appears that the contesting respondents are not so serious to oppose the prayer made in this petition.

The counsel for the petitioner states that given one opportunity, the petitioner shall produce the left out witness at his own responsibility.

Having heard counsel for the petitioner and keeping in view the stand taken on behalf of the petitioner and also in the interest of justice, this revision petition is allowed to the extent that the Rent Controller shall grant one more and last opportunity to the petitioner to produce the left out witness at his own responsibility and subject to payment of Rs.3500/- as costs to the respondent – landlords.

Dasti.

October 26, 2009.
dinesh

(**SURYA KANT**)
JUDGE