

## Mohinder Kaur Vs Kailash Rani and Another

**Court:** High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

**Date of Decision:** Dec. 14, 2006

**Acts Referred:** East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, 1949 "Section 13

**Citation:** (2007) 1 CivCC 435 : (2007) 1 RCR(Rent) 79

**Hon'ble Judges:** Vinod K.Sharma, J

**Bench:** Single Bench

**Advocate:** S.C. Kapoor, with Mr. Harminderjeet Singh, for the Appellant;

**Final Decision:** Dismissed

### Judgement

Vinod K. Sharma, J.

The present revision petition has been filed against the order of ejectment passed by the learned Courts below u/s 13

of the East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, 1949 (for short the "Act") on the ground that the property in possession of the petitioner tenant has

become unfair and unsafe for human habitation.

2. In the petition by the landlord-respondents u/s 13 of the Act, it was claimed that major portion of the property had already fallen and the room

in possession of the petitioner had also become unfit and unsafe for human habitation. It was further claimed that the property was more than 100

years old and the room in possession of the tenant-petitioner was carved out by the landlord-respondents from the back portion which has already

fallen. On the basis of the evidence led on record, learned Courts below came to the conclusion that the building has become unfit and unsafe for

human habitation and ordered the ejectment of the petitioner-tenant from the shop in dispute

3. Mr.S.C.Kapoor, Senior Advocate, appearing with Mr.Harminderjeet Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner challenged the findings of the learned

Authorities below primarily on the ground that the major portion of the building was demolished by the landlord-respondents and, therefore, no

ejectment could be ordered as the landlords could not be allowed to take benefit of their own wrongs. In support of this contention, learned Senior

Counsel for the petitioner placed reliance on the judgment of this Court in the case of Ramji Dass Nirmohi v. Gurbux Singh, 1998 HRR 548.

4. I have considered the arguments raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner and find no force in the same. It was nowhere proved on record

that it was the landlords, who have damaged the property as alleged, rather the documentary and oral evidence? on record showed that the

building had become unfit and unsafe for human habitation. In this regard, it would be appropriate to reproduce the finding recorded by the learned

lower Appellate Court, which reads as under :-

RW-4 Hira Lal examined by the tenant has admitted in his cross- examination that he has not gone into the shop in dispute from the last 5/6 years.

RW-2 Subash Chander has been examined by the tenant. Subash Chander is the husband of Kailash Rani i.e. landlady and he is the brother of

Harvinder Kumar - Power of Attorney of both the landladies. He has admitted in his cross-examination that now the shop in question is in more

"Khasta Halat" and that the shop in dispute can fall at any time. So. from the perusal of the testimony of both the expert witnesses, photographs

produced by both the parties " and admission of RW-2 that the shop in dispute can fall at any time, 1 fully agree with the findings of the Ld.Rent

Controller that the shop in dispute has become unfit and unsafe for human habitation.

5. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner by making reference to this finding contended that once the report of the Expert was looked into, then

presumption had to be drawn that it was the landlords, who demolished the property. However, 1 find no force in this contention. The Expert was

produced by the petitioner, who instead of admitting the damage to the property, gave an opinion that the portion in possession of the tenant was

good. This report cannot help the petitioner as the building has to be seen as a whole and not only a part in possession of the tenant. In the present

case, the portion in possession of the tenant was also in dilapidated condition and, therefore, the learned Authorities below rightly came to the

conclusion that the building in question was unfit and unsafe for human habitation. This finding of fact recorded by the learned Courts below cannot

be said to be perverse so as to enable this Court to interfere in exercise of revisional jurisdiction.

6. Accordingly, there is no merit in the present revision petition, which is dismissed in limine.

7. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner thereafter prayed that as the petitioner is running business from the disputed portion of the building,

she may be granted time to vacate the premises. This request of the petitioner is accepted and she is granted three months" time to hand-over the

vacant possession of the property in dispute to the landlord-respondents. This shall, however, be subject to the following conditions :-

(i) That the petitioner would file an undertaking within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order before this Court to the effect that she would

hand-over the vacant possession of the tenanted premises to the landlord- respondents on or before 13th of March,2007.

(ii) That she will clear all the arrears of rent and shall continue to pay the rent by 10th of each month in advance during this period.