

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR No.1708 of 2015
Date of decision: 28.09.2015

Gurnam Singh and another

... Petitioners

Versus

Jathedar Shingara and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Paramjit Singh Jammu, Advocate,
for the petitioners.
Mr. AS Khinda, Advocate for respondent No.1.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

ARUN PALLI J. (Oral)

Vide order being assailed, dated 12.02.2015, rendered by Additional Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.), Nakodar, rebuttal evidence of the petitioners-plaintiffs had since been closed by order.

A bare reading of the impugned order reveals that;
“the counsel for defendants suffered a statement today in the court that defendants have told him telephonically that they do not dispute ownership and possession of the plaintiffs over the property and in case in any demarcation, it is proved that there is any soil and stones in Khasra No.19//15/1 and 19//14 as alleged by

the plaintiffs, then they will have no objection if the plaintiffs remove the said soil and stones.”

During the course of hearing even before this court, learned counsel for the respondents maintains that since neither do the defendants claim title nor possession over the suit property, comprised in Khasra No.19//15/1 and 19//14, and if at all it is found that some stones or soil are kept over the said property, respondents shall have no grievance or concern, if the same are removed.

That being so, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the revision petition be disposed of in terms of the stand set out by the defendants before the trial court as also the statement made by learned counsel for the respondents before this court.

Ordered, accordingly.

September 28, 2015
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge