



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

\*\*\*\*

132

CR-2736-2025

Date of Decision.:07.05.2025

M/s Raman Medical Store

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Smt. Narinder Sharma and Another

.....Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA**

Present:- Mr. Vikas Jain, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raman Mahajan, Advocate  
for the respondents.

\*\*\*\*

**DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)**

This is tenant's revision against the concurrent findings of the courts below, whereby his ejection has been ordered.

2. Petition under Section 13 of the Rent Restriction Act as filed by the landlord (*respondents herein*) for ejection of tenant from the demised premises was accepted by learned Rent Controller on 13.12.2017 by holding that landlords have successfully proved the legal necessity for seeking the ejection. The appeal as filed by the tenant i.e., petitioner herein was dismissed by the Appellate Authority on 21.02.2025.

3. Assailing the findings, it is contended by learned counsel that first floor and second floor of the premises are lying vacant and that the landlord could not prove that those premises were not suitable to start the business of academic classes as ejection was by petitioner No.1 on this ground only so as to project her bonafide need.

4. This Court does not find merit in the aforesaid contention. It is

**CR-2736-2025****-2-**

for the landlord to decide as to which of the premises are suitable so as to fulfill his/her requirements. Tenant is nobody to dictate his terms in this regard. Both the Courts below have returned the concurrent findings of facts by holding the requirement of the landlords to be bonafide for seeking the ejectment of the tenant i.e., petitioner herein and this Court does not find any ground to interfere in the concurrent findings in this regard.

5. Faced with the aforesaid situation, learned counsel for the petitioner- tenant prays this Court to grant a period of 1½ year so as to vacate the premises.

6. At this stage, Mr. Raman Mahajan, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the respondents and submits that the period sought by the petitioner for vacating the premises is quite unreasonable and that respondent has no objection to grant a period of one month to the petitioner to vacate the premises.

7. Having considered submissions of both the sides, this Court disposes of the present petition with the direction to the petitioner- tenant to vacate the demised premises on or before 30.09.2025. It is made clear that the petitioner- tenant will continue to pay the agreed rent regularly till vacation of the premises on or before 30.09.2025; and in case it fails to do so and the respondents- landlords are compelled to file the execution, then the petitioner will have to pay mesne profit at the rate of 50 times the present rent being paid by him, with effect from 01.10.2025 onwards, till the actual vacation of the premises.

Disposed of accordingly.

**(DEEPAK GUPTA)**  
**JUDGE**

**May 07, 2025**

Neetika Tuteja

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No