

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

C.R. No.3123 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision.25.05.2015

Sant Singh @ Sat Singh @ Nachattar Singh and othersPetitioners

Versus

Sadhu Singh and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Janak Singh Bhinder, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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. There is no merit at all in the revision brought at the instance of the 10th defendant on a plea that at an earlier point of time, there has been a suit instituted in respect of very same subject matter in civil suit No.311 of 2013. According to him, the Court has ordered status quo and the injunction ordered now obtained by the respondent conflicts with the said decision.

2. Status quo is indeed the desirable manner of preserving the status regarding possession at a time when the suit is instituted and when an interim injunction is sought for. If there is an observation that the present petitioner is in possession and the Court has ordered status quo of such possession then it is possible for the party to complain that a subsequent order of injunction obtained by the very same party will create a conflict. The counsel is unable to show to me any order or observation that his alleged possession has been recognized already in

the suit No.311 of 2013. If there was a prima facie proof of possession available through the revenue records and the Courts below have granted injunction in favour of the respondent who was the plaintiff in that case, I will not find any error in the order for intervention.

3. The revision petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

May 25, 2015
Pankaj*