

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 1071 of 2014 (O/M)

Date of decision : 20.8.2015

Sheo Chand

..... Revisionist

Versus

Om Parkash

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Vinod Khunger, Advocate, for the revisionist.

Ms. Ravinder Kaur Manaise, Advocate, for respondent.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
  2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
  3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?
- .- -.-

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

The present revision has been filed against the order dated 1.4.2013 (Annexure-P-3), passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Fazilka, affirming the order dated 27.7.2012 (Annexure-P-1), passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Abohar, whereby the application of the plaintiff/respondent under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, was allowed and consequently, the defendants were restrained from blocking, causing any hinderance or encroaching upon the passage in dispute.

CR No. 1071 of 2014 (O/M)

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have also carefully gone through the file.

It comes out that both the parties are real brothers. Learned counsel has referred to the earlier judgment between the parties i.e. dated 4.1.2011 (Annexure-P-2), passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Abohar, in which both the brothers, who are revisionist and respondent before this Court, were arrayed as defendants. It is a contest between the brothers. The lower Court as well as the appellate Court has already examined the facts and and thereafter, the impugned orders were passed. Therefore, in exercising the revisional power, this Court does not find any ground to interfere in the impugned orders.

The revision is accordingly dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)  
JUDGE

20.8.2015  
sjks