



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

125

CR-3802-2025

Date of Decision.:03.07.2025

Naresh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Neelkanth

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- Mr. J.S. Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

It is tenant's revision against his ejectment order passed by learned Rent Controller, Karnal on 31.05.2023 in rent petition No.RP-10-2021, which has been affirmed by the Appellate Authority vide order dated 17.04.2025.

2. The landlord (*respondent herein*) sought ejectment of the tenant (*petitioner herein*) under Section 13 of the Haryana Urban (Control of Rent and Eviction) Act, 1973 from the demised premises on the ground of non-payment of the rent for the period with effect from July, 2018 to 31.01.2021 @ ₹9,000/- per month. The tenant *i.e. petitioner herein* pleaded the rate of rent to be ₹5,000/- per month and that nothing was due.

3. Vide order dated 16.05.2023 (*copy Annexure P4*), learned Rent Controller assessed the provisional rent @ ₹5,000/- per month for the period July, 2018 to 31.01.2021 and adjourned the case to 31.05.2023 for tendering the provisionally assessed rent of ₹1,68,500/-, which included the interest and cost. The tenant failed to tender the provisionally assessed rent resulting in the order dated 31.05.2023 (*Annexure P-5*) for his eviction

**CR-3802-2025****-2-**

by the Rent Controller. As noted earlier that the said order has been affirmed by the Appellate Authority vide order dated 17.04.2025 (*Annexure P-7*).

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner- tenant prays for reasonable time so as to vacate the premises. He further submits that petitioner may be granted time to pay the rent.

5. There is no merit in any of the said contentions.

6. As has been rightly observed by the Courts below that once the tenant has failed to make compliance of the interim order regarding tendering of the provisionally assessed rent, nothing else remained to be done except for the order of eviction. Reliance has rightly been placed upon "*Rakesh Wadhawan vs. M/s Jagdamba Industrial Corporation*" 2002 1) *RCR Rent 514*. Learned Rent Controller vide order dated 31.05.2023 had given three months time to the tenant to vacate the premises but instead of doing so, he preferred appeal, which was dragged upto 17.04.2025 and was ultimately dismissed.

7. In the aforesaid facts and circumstances, petitioner- tenant does not deserve any leniency whatsoever from this Court.

No merits. Dismissed.

**(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE**

July 03, 2025

Neetika Tuteja

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