



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

116

**CR No. 6542 of 2025 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION :- 17.09.2025**

Gurvinder Kaur**...Petitioner****Versus****Bharat Bhushan****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIRINDER AGGARWAL**

Present:- Mr. A.P. Kaushal, Advocate with
Ms. Pallavi Bahre, Advocate for the petitioner.

VIRINDER AGGARWAL, J. (Oral)

1. This revision petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India has been filed for seeking directions to learned Rent Controller, Ludhiana to decide the application filed by the respondent for leave to defend. After filing of the application for leave to defend respondent moved another application for condonation of delay in filing that application and thereafter one another application under Order 7 Rule 11 of CPC for rejection of the petition and the application for leave to defend is pending since November, 2024. The petitioner is a 70 years old widow and she has filed an ejectment petition on the grounds of personal necessity as she requires the premises for her three children. Now considering the fact that a period of nearly 10 months has elapsed and the application for leave to defend has not been decided by the learned Rent Controller. Ejectment petitions filed on the grounds of personal necessity are required to be disposed of expeditiously, particularly in the cases of Senior Citizens. So it is clear that the learned Rent Controller has not exercised the jurisdiction vested in the Court.



2. The revision petition is allowed and Rent Controller is directed to dispose of all the three applications within a period of one month from the date next fixed before the Rent Controller.

3. The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

4. Since the main petition stands decided, the miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

(VIRINDER AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

17.09.2025

P.Singh

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No