
(2012) 07 AHC CK 0164
In the Allahabad High Court
Case No : Writ - A No. -11781 of 1999

Sushil Kumar

APPELLANT

Vs

Add.City Magistrate (L)/R.C.E.O.& Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 26-07-2012

Acts Referred:

Uttar Pradesh Urban Buildings (Regulation of Letting, Rent and Eviction) Rules, 1972
— Rule 22(f)

Citation : (2012) 07 AHC CK 0164

Hon'ble Judges : Sudhir Agarwal, J

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Sudhir Agarwal,J.

1. Sri Arvind Srivastava, learned counsel for the petitioner states that he has no instruction. Though the name of Sri L.P. Singh is also shown in the cause list but neither anyone is present to press this writ petition nor any adjournment has been sought on his behalf. Sri O.P. Singh, Senior Advocate, assisted by Sri J. N. Singh, learned counsel for the respondents is present. I have perused the record.

2. This writ petition has been filed against the order dated 06.02.1999 passed by Additional City Magistrate First/Rent Control and Eviction Officer, Kanpur Nagar, respondent no. 1, rejecting petitioner's application under Rule 22 (f) of U.P. Urban Buildings (Regulation of Letting, Rent and Eviction) Rule, 1972. The Prescribed Authority has recorded the finding that by moving the said application the petitioner has tried to misuse the process of law.

3. Having gone through the impugned order as also the pleadings and grounds taken in the writ petition, I do not find any error apparent on the face of record in the order impugned in this writ petition warranting interference. The findings of fact have been recorded which have not been shown perverse or contrary to material on record. I, therefore, do not find any reason to interfere in exercise of supervisory power of this Court under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India. The scope of judicial review under Article 227 is very limited and narrow

as discussed in detail by this Court in Civil Misc. Writ Petition No. 27433 of 1991 (Lala Ram Narain Vs. Xth Additional District Judge, Moradabad and others) decided on 13.07.2012. There is nothing which may justify judicial review of order impugned in this writ petition in the light of exposition of law, as discussed in the above judgment.

4. In view of the above, I do not find any reason to interfere. Dismissed.

5. Interim order, if any, stands vacated.