
(1987) 02 P&H CK 0088
In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh
Case No : Civil Revision No. 3486 of 1986

Shri Fateh Chand Verma

APPELLANT

Vs

Shri Balbir Singh

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 02-02-1987

Acts Referred:

East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, 1949 — Section 13A

Citation : (1987) 2 ILR (P&H) 505

Hon'ble Judges : J.V. Gupta, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Amarjit Markan and Mr. Yash Paul Khullar, for the Appellant; H.L. Sarin for Miss. Ritu Bahri, Miss Jaishree Thakur and Mr. Arihant Jain, for the Respondent

Judgement

J.V. Gupta, J.—This petition is directed against the order of the Rent Controller dated 25.10.1986 where by in a petition filed u/s 13-A of the East Punjab Urban Rent Restriction Act, (for short the Act) leave to contest was granted and. It was further held that the landlord was not a "specified landlord" as defined therein.

2. Admittedly, the landlord-Petitioner was in the employment of the New Delhi Municipal Committee from where he retired with effect from 31.8.1984 as Assistant Secretary (Inquiry). Claiming himself to be a specified landlord as defined u/s 2 (hh) of the Act, he moved ejectment application on 7.11.1986 against his tenant Balbir Singh from the house in dispute alleging that he has retired from the service and needs the demised premises for his bona fide personal necessity. When the notice was served on the tenant, he filed an application u/s 18-A (5) of the Act for the grant of permission to contest the application. He took up the plea that the landlord had no necessity and is not in need of the house in dispute. He is permanently residing at Delhi where he owns a residential house. Further, the landlord also owns another suitable residential accommodation at Malerkotla Besides he is not a "specified landlord" within the meaning of the Act and the tenant was, therefore, not entitled to ejectment.

3. According to the learned Rent Controller, New Delhi Municipal Committee is neither a State Government nor Central Government, and, therefore, the landlord could not be said to be a "specific landlord" as defined under the Act. It was further found that the tenant has brought on the record through his affidavit that the landlord is a permanent resident of New Delhi and he has a residential accommodation there as well and an other suitable accommodation at Malerkotla and the landlord has failed to rebut that affidavit. In these circumstances, leave to contest was granted

4. The main controversy between the parties in this petition is as to whether the landlord falls within the definition of specified landlord or not. The definition of specified landlord u/s 2 (hh) of the Act is as under:-

"2 (hh) "specified landlord" means a person who is entitled to receive rent in respect of a building on his own account and who is holding or has held an appointment in a public service or post in connection with the affairs of the Union or of a State." With this petition, a certificate annexure P-4 has been filed which has been issued by the Secretary New Delhi Municipal Committee dated 21.10.1986. It has been stated therein that Shri Fateh Chand Verma has retired from municipal service with effect from 31.10.1984 as Assistant Secretary (inquiry). His post is pension able and he is getting the pension. The Central Civil Service (Conduct) Rules and F. R. and S. R. Government of India are adopted in this office as amended from time to time, N.D.M.C. is being governed and controlled by Delhi Administration, Delhi, headed by Lt. Governor, Delhi. Thus, it could not be disputed that the Petitioner had held a post being in the employment of N.D.M.C. With this background the relevant provision of the Act may now be noticed.

5. As is evident from the definition of "Specified landlord" inserted by Section 2 (hh) of the Act. the landlord has to be either in public service or had held an appointment therein, or he must be holding or had held a post in connection with the affairs of the Union or of a State In the present case, even if the Petitioner is not deemed to be in public service or in the State Service as such but he certainly falls in the category of those who are serving in connection with the affairs of the State. It is the duty of the State to provide civic amenities to its citizens and for that purpose the States have been given powers under Entry 5, List II of Schedule VII of the Constitution to make laws. The municipalities have thus been created all over the State to enable them to discharge the functions of providing civic amenities to the citizens. Their employees thus cannot be said to be not working in connection with the affairs of the State. Otherwise, also, the municipalities are always held to be State within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution. In *Sirsi Municipality by its President Sirsi Vs. Cecilia Kom Francis Tellis*, a case relating to a dismissed employee of the municipality, a declaration of continuity of service holding the order to be null and void was granted which is otherwise only the preserve of public servants. Section 21 of the Indian Penal Code defines "public servant." Under clause

twelfth (b) thereof "every person in the service or pay of a local authority etc. etc." has been declared as a "public servant". Thus, looking from any angle, it has to be held that the employees of the municipal committees are working in connection with the affairs of the State and are thus entitled to the benefits of a "Specified Landlord" within the meaning of the Act.

6. Moreover somewhat analogous matter has been discussed in detail by this Court in (Dr. Dina Nath Gulati v. Smt. Santokh Kaur (1987) 91 P.L.R. 171.) In view of that, no meaningful argument could be raised on behalf of the Respondent in this behalf. The only argument raised was that according to the statement of Object and Reasons for bringing this amendment in the original Act by virtue of Punjab Act No. 2 of 1985, only the State Government employees or the Defence personnel or other Central Government employees are entitled to the benefit of the said amendment and, therefore, no other employees could claim themselves to be specified landlords. I am afraid J this submission is devoid of force since the "Objects and Reasons" are never all pervading and exhaustive.

7. Since in the present case the landlord had held an appointment in the New Delhi Municipal Committee, he was certainly holding an appointment on a post in connection with the affairs of the State. It is not disputed that the Municipal Committee is governed and controlled by the Delhi Administration, Delhi, headed by a Lt. Governor. Thus, for all intents and purposes, the Petitioner is fully covered by the definition of specified landlord. The finding of the Rent Controller in this behalf is wholly wrong and misconceived and is set aside.

8. Since the permission to contest the application has been granted on the basis of the affidavit filed by the tenant that the landlord owns another suitable residential accommodation at Malerkotla and the same has more accommodation than the house in dispute, which fact has been denied by the landlord in his affidavit dated 6.9.1986, therefore, before the tenant is allowed to contest the petition, he must file an additional affidavit giving complete details of the other suitable residential accommodation at Malerkotla with the landlord. Such an affidavit be filed within a week of the appearance of the parties, who are directed to appear before the Rent Controller on 15.2.1987. In case no such affidavit is filed, the tenant will not be entitled to contest the petition. If such an affidavit is filed, the ejectment application will be tried from day to day till the hearing is concluded and application decided as contemplated under Sub-section (6) of Section 18-A of the Act.

9. The petition is disposed of accordingly with no order as to costs.