

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**C.R. No.2302 of 2012
Date of Decision.04.08.2015**

Mahesh Kumar and othersPetitioners

Versus

Chaman LalRespondent

Present: Mr. Arihant Jain, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Tajender K. Joshi, Advocate
for the respondent.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

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?

-.-

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. Learned counsel for the respondent states that the property has been taken possession of and the revision petition has become infructuous. The petitioner has no instructions.

2. The revision petition is dismissed as having become infructuous and it is open to the petitioner for any modification of the order if the statement of the respondent is found to be not correct or the matter still requires an adjudication on merits.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

**August 04, 2015
Pankaj***