



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

298

CR-1490-2024 (O&amp;M)

Decided on:21.01.2025

Sandeep Kumar Gupta

. . . Petitioner

Versus

Ramesh Kumar Bakshi

. . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr. Neeraj Goel, Advocate  
for the petitioner.Mr. Saurabh Singla, Advocate  
for the respondent.

\*\*\*\*\*

**VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)**

1. Challenge in the present revision petition is to the judgment passed by the Rent Controller and by the appellate Authority vide which the eviction order has been passed.
2. On 11.03.2024, a Coordinate Bench of this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

*“Present: Mr. Neeraj Goel, Advocate for the petitioner.*

\*\*\*\*

*The only contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner is that he has been in occupation of the demised premises for the last about 30 years and now has accepted the concurrent findings returned by the authorities below. It is further submitted that the petitioner has already acquired an alternate accommodation in the vicinity, wherein renovation is being carried out and completion of which is likely to take a few months more. Thus, he only seeks some reasonable period of time to hand over vacant possession of the demised premises.*



*Notice of motion to the respondent/landlord for seeking necessary consent, keeping in view the limited prayer noticed above.*

*List on 23.04.2024.*

*Process dasti as well.*

*March 11, 2024”*

2. Learned counsel for the respondent has produced the copy of the order dated 15.07.2024 to show that the possession has been handed over and the execution has been fully satisfied and thus, the present petition has been rendered infructuous.

3. In view of the above, present Civil Revision Petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

**21.01.2025**

*Mehak*

*Whether reasoned/speaking?  
Whether reportable?*

**(VIKAS BAHL)  
JUDGE**

*Yes/~~No~~  
~~Yes~~/No*