



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

129

**CR No.4131 of 2025 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision :23.07.2025**

**Joginderpal**

**.....Petitioner**

**Versus**

**Darshan Kaur**

**..... Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL**

Present : Mr. Raj Kumar Chandana, Advocate for the petitioner.

**VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (Oral):**

The instant revision petition has been preferred under Article 227 of the Constitution of India against order dated 27.05.2025, passed by the Court of District Judge, Ludhiana, vide which the transfer application moved by the petitioner seeking transfer of eviction petition bearing number RP/376/2022 titled as Darshan Kaur Vs. Joinderpal from the Court of Sh. Gurinder Singh, Rent Controller, Ludhiana to any other Court of competent jurisdiction was dismissed.

2. The facts as emanating from the revision petition, are that the respondent-landlord (Darshan Kaur) instituted a petition (Annexure P-1) under Section 20 of the Punjab Rent Act, 1995 (hereinafter referred to as '1995 Act') against the petitioner/tenant Joginder Pal for his eviction from a house (fully described in the petition) situated in Kot Mangal Singh, Ludhiana. An application (Annexure P-4) was moved by the present petitioner for transfer of the said rent petition from the Court of Sh. Gurinder Singh, learned Rent



Controller, Ludhiana, to some other Court of competent jurisdiction. It was alleged that the applicant had no hope of getting justice from the said Court as the concerned Court was not giving time for preparing arguments and was giving very short dates.

3. This application was dismissed by the District Judge Ludhiana, leading to the filing of the instant revision petition.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the Court of Rent Controller, Ludhiana, was giving very short dates, the petitioner was not getting enough time to prepare for arguments which had led to a genuine apprehension that the petitioner would not get justice from the said Court.

6. The plea, on the face of it, is mis-founded. The rent petition was filed by the respondent/landlord in 2022. The case is stated to be fixed for arguments. Merely stating in the application that there is no action plan would not mean that the Court is expected to give long dates in the matter. The District Judge Ludhiana, sought comments from the concerned Presiding Officer also and after examining the same, rejected the transfer application. In fact, the defence of the present petitioner had been struck off and after closing of evidence of the landlord, the petition was fixed for arguments. It was stated that part arguments had also been heard but despite seeking 4-5 adjournments, no arguments had been addressed on behalf of the present petitioner.

7. Having perused the transfer application and the order passed by the District Judge, Ludhiana and having considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, I do not find any reason to interfere in the



order passed by the learned District Judge, Ludhiana.

8. Accordingly, the revision petition stands dismissed.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

**(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**23.07.2025**

*Manoj Bhutani*

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No