



1

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

130

CR-5991-2025 (O&amp;M)

Date of decision: 01.09.2025

**MUKESH KUMAR GUPTA****.... PETITIONER****VERSUS****DR. RAVI KANT SINCE DECEASED THROUGH LRs. & ORS.****....RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN**

Present: Mr. Satyaveer Singh, Advocate and  
Ms. Divyanshi Rathore, Advocate  
Mr. Abhyudaya Paliwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN, J. (Oral)**

1. Prayer in the present revision petition is for setting aside the order dated 19.08.2025 passed by the Rent Controller, Chandigarh, whereby, the petitioner-tenant was not allowed to recall the two witnesses, who were examined by the opposite party i.e. the respondent-landlord, for further cross-examination,

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondents-landlord instituted an ejectment petition against the petitioner-tenant in respect of the demised premises on the grounds of personal necessity as well as on the ground that the petitioner-tenant had ceased to occupy the premises. The respondents examined two witnesses, i.e PW-1/Dr. Mridula Mahajan and PW-2/Dr. Ramit Mahajan, who were duly cross-examined by counsel for the petitioner. However, during the course of their examination, the Income Tax Returns of the respondent-landlord were not tendered into evidence. Subsequently, additional issues were framed, and counsel for the



2

respondent-landlord tendered into evidence a series of documents Exhibits P1 to P25, including the Income Tax Returns. The Income Tax Returns Exhibit (P16 to P25) were introduced only after the cross-examination of the said witnesses was concluded. By declining the request of the petitioner to conduct further cross-examination of the respondent-landlord's witnesses, a valuable right to cross-examine the landlords on their contents, authenticity and relevance has been declined.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the paper book.

4. The petitioner had already conducted the cross-examination of the aforesaid two witnesses, who have been examined by the respondent-landlord. While conducting the cross-examination, the petitioner had confronted the said witnesses about the Income Tax Returns and asked the relevant questions. No request was made to defer the cross-examination of the witnesses till they produce the said Income Tax Returns. Rather, it has been observed by the learned Rent Controller that PW-1 had stated in the cross-examination that she shall produce the said Income Tax Returns through her counsel.

5. No application was filed by the petitioner-tenant for issuance of a direction to the respondent-landlord to produce the Income Tax Returns before the examination of the said witnesses.

6. Keeping in view the fact that the said Income Tax Returns have been submitted in evidence by the counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-landlord and the respondent-landlord had chosen not to produce



3

such documents during her examination-in-chief and the fact that the learned Rent Controller had also observed that admissibility of such documents shall be decided at the time of final decision of this case, as such, no prejudice has been caused to the petitioner if his request for recalling the witnesses examined by the respondent-landlord, has been declined.

7. No illegality or irregularity is found in the impugned order dated 19.08.2025, as such, the impugned order is upheld and the present petition, being devoid of merits, is dismissed.

8. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

**(HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN)**  
**JUDGE**

**01.09.2025**

*Kusum/Simran*

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>