

CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION CHALLENGING THE JUDGMENT AND ORDER PASSED BY APPELLATE BENCH OF SMALL CAUSES COURT

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICAT	URE AT
CIVIL APPELLATE JURIS	BDICTION
CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION NO	. OF
(UNDER SECTION 115 OF CIVIL PRO	CEDURE CODE,1908)
	DIST:
1.)
2.	
3.	
4.	
All heirs and legal representatives	of)
and)
residing at)
)
)
) Appellants (Orig. Defendants)
Versus	
1)
residing at,)
)



		• ((
2.)	
3.)	
4.)	
5.	, all)	
	2 to 5 heirs and legal representatives)	
	Of Deceased)	
	residing at	
6.		
	residing at,	
) Respondent	s
	(Orig. Plaintiff	
тив	E APPLICANTS MOST RESPECTFULLY STATE AS U	INDER
11111	S ATTECANTO MOST RESTECTIONET STATE AS O	NDLK
_		
1.	1. The Applicants herein being the legal heirs of o	riginal
	Defendant No. 1, are the original Defendants and a	are the
	tenants of premises being Flat No situa	ted at
	, (hereinafter referred to as	s "Suit
	Flat"). The Applicants and their parents have	been
	occupying and residing in the Suit Flat ever since th	ne year
	till date. For the sake of convenience, the j	parties
	are hereinafter respectively referred to by their o	riginal



designation in the title in the suit namely the Applicants as the Defendants and the Respondents as the Plaintiffs. The original Defendant No. 1, (since deceased), was the mother of Defendant Nos. 2 to 5. The Respondents herein are the landlords of the Suit Flat and are the original Plaintiffs (including legal heirs of Plaintiff No. 2).

2. The Plaintiffs had filed R.A.E. Suit No/ of
against the Defendants seeking eviction of the Defendants
on the purported ground of bonafide requirement. By an
order dated, the Hon'ble Court of Small Causes
Court at was pleased to dismiss the suit.
However, in Appeal No of filed by the
Plaintiffs, the Hon'ble Appellate Bench of the Hon'ble
Court of Small Causes at, vide its Order and
Judgment dated, transcribed and signed on
, was pleased to allow the Appeal and to decree
the suit for eviction of the Defendants. The Hon'ble
Appellate Bench, with utmost respect, completely
misapplied the well settled position in law that a
simplicitor desire to obtain the possession of the premises
in occupation of the tenant could not be said to be a
bonafide requirement entitling the landlords to a decree











































































































































