
(2005) 1 ARC 678

Allahabad High Court

Case No: Writ Petition No. 5944 of 1984

Bharat Bhushan and
Others

APPELLANT

Vs

Vlth Additional District
Judge and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Dec. 3, 2004

Acts Referred:

Uttar Pradesh Urban Buildings (Regulation of Letting, Rent and Eviction) Act, 1972 " Section 21(1), 21(7), 3

Citation: (2005) 1 ARC 678

Hon'ble Judges: Vikram Nath, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: R.K. Misra, for the Appellant; Pankaj Mittal, for the Respondent

Final Decision: Allowed

Judgement

Vikram Nath, J.

This writ petition has been filed by the tenant for quashing the judgment and order dated 5.4.1984 and 8.11.1979 passed

by the respondent Nos. 1 and 2 respectively, whereby the application of the landlord respondent No. 3 u/s 3 of the U.P. Act No. III of 1947 was

allowed by the Prescribed Authority and the appeal filed against the same was dismissed.

2. The dispute relates to house No. 239 (new 339), situated in Mohalla Ishwarpuri, Meerut City, Meerut, Murrari Lal the landlord, respondent

No. 3 set up need of the premises in dispute for his own use and for the use of his family members on the ground that the existing accommodation

is not adequate and further on the ground that he was living in a rented accommodation and wanted to live in his house. Initially, the application was

rejected by the Prescribed Authority. Later on Murari Lal filed another application u/s 21 (1) (a) of the U.P. Act 13 of 1972, and the Prescribed

Authority by order dated 8.10.1979 allowed the release application and directed for eviction of the petitioner holding that the need set up by the

landlord was genuine and bona fide and further that the petitioner would not suffer any hardship as he had purchased a plot and he could make

constructions on the same. Aggrieved by the same the petitioner filed an appeal, which was dismissed vide order dated 5.4.1984. Aggrieved by the

same the petitioner has filed present writ petition, in which he is enjoying an interim order since 24.4.1984.

3. I have heard Sri R.K. Mishra, Advocate, holding brief of Sri Neeraj Agarwal, learned Counsel for the petitioner. On behalf of Sri Pankaj Mittal,

appearing for the respondent No. 3, statement has been made that he has no instructions in the matter.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner has urged that during pendency of the petition Murari Lal respondent No. 3 who had set up the need for the

premises in dispute for self and his family members has sold the property in dispute by a registered sale deed dated 15.1.2002 in favour of Sri

Rajendra Kumar. The sale deed has been annexed as Annexure-1 to the affidavit filed alongwith an application dated 5.2.2002 being Civil Misc.

Application No. 26606 of 2002. Sri R.K. Mishra, Advocate has made statement that copy of the said application was served on Sri Pankaj

Mittal, Advocate also and the endorsement of receipt dated 19.2.2002 is available on his office copy. The need set up by Murari Lal, thus

completely vanished after the execution of the sale deed by him in favour of Rajendra Kumar.

5. Subsequent purchaser cannot pursue this application for release up on the basis of the need of Murari Lal and his family members. The

subsequent purchaser is not a member of the family of Murari Lal. The subsequent purchaser will have to establish his own bona fide need to get

the premises vacated. This is also legal provision laid down in the Section 21 (7) of the Act. Learned Counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the

judgment of the Court reported in 1992 ACJ 1062 for the proposition that where the landlord during pendency of the proceedings has transferred

the premises dispute, then need of the landlord stands finished and the purchaser has to set up and establish his own independent need.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the cases, the need of the landlord Murari Lal for release would no longer be maintainable and will

have to be rejected. Accordingly, the writ petition succeeds and is allowed and impugned order dated 5.4.1984 and 8.10.1979 passed by the

respondents No. 1 and 2 as set aside and the release application filed by Murari Lal is also dismissed.