

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

**C.R. No.2635 of 2013  
Date of Decision.27.03.2015**

|                         |        |                  |
|-------------------------|--------|------------------|
| Gopal Krishan           | Versus | .....Petitioner  |
| Satish Kumar and others |        | .....Respondents |

Present: Mr. Nitin Goyal, Advocate for  
Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. R.S. Malik, Advocate  
for respondent No.1.

**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 revision petition is against the order of appointment of local commissioner made under Order 26 Rule 9 CPC. The counsel for the petitioner says that the local commissioner, who is a Tehsildar, has actually inspected the property and has also filed a report. He has also been cited as witness for examination. At this stage, the question of considering a challenge to the appointment cannot be considered. The counsel for the petitioner states that the local commissioner could not have been appointed. The petitioner may use such objection at the time when a reliance is sought to be made on the commissioner's report at the time of arguments.

2. With these observations, the revision petition is disposed of.

**(K. KANNAN)  
JUDGE**

**March 27, 2015  
Pankaj\***