

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

C.R. No.2583 of 2015

Date of Decision.20.04.2015

Chhinda Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Darshan Singh

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Keshav Kataria, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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. The petitioner cannot be taken to be an aggrieved person especially in the situation where his contention is that he is not the owner of the property and the alleged sale in favour of the plaintiff is not true. According to him, his parents are the owners and both of them are alive. They can always protect their own interest to the property setting up the alleged sale by their own son as not binding to them. The petitioner cannot have a written statement amended which is grossly at variance to the written statement already filed where he has not denied the sale in the written statement and has also not set up the plea that he is not the owner of the property.

2. The civil revision petition is disposed of with the above observations.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

April 20, 2015
Pankaj*