

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

CR No.4869 of 2012 (O&M)

Date of decision : 29.10.2015

Surjit Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Gurdeep Singh and ors.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL.

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

Present: Ms. Promila Nain, Advocate for the petitioners.

None for the respondents.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

Ms. Promila Nain, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioners submits, that for the adjudication of the present revision petition, service upon respondent No.3 (LRs of defendant No.1) be dispensed with as there is no clash of interest between petitioners and Narinder Kaur.

The present revision petition is at the instance of defendant Nos.2 and 3 against the order dated 24.04.2012 passed by the Lower Appellate Court, whereby appeal filed against the order dated 08.04.2009 vide which the application filed under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 CPC, has been dismissed, has been allowed and the petitioners have been restrained

from alienating the land.

Ms. Promila Nain, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioners-defendant Nos.2 and 3 submits, that petitioners are the bona fide purchaser for a valuable consideration from defendant No.1-Kuldeep Singh deceased being represented by Narinder Kaur, respondent No.3-herein. The respondent Nos.1 and 2-plaintiffs have sought specific performance of agreement to sell which is alleged to have been executed on prior date than the sale deed executed in favour of the petitioners. The trial Court on the basis of the documentary evidence found that there was no balance of convenience, much less, prima facie case in his favour and declined the relief. However, the Lower Appellate Court, in appeal, enjoined the petitioner from not alienating the property during the pendency of the suit.

The revision petition is of year 2012.

Without commenting upon merits and demerits of the matter, I deem it appropriate to issue appropriate direction to the trial Court to decide the suit as early as possible preferably within a period of six months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

With the aforementioned direction, revision petition stands disposed of.

29.10.2015

pawan

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**