

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

**Civil Revision No.5050 of 2015
Date of Decision: August 11, 2015**

Rajbir Petitioner

vs.

Paras @ Parsa and others Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Sumit Sangwan, Advocate for the petitioner.

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

Challenged in the present revision petition is the order dated 17.07.2015 passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Dadri, vide which the court at the stage of orders felt that it is a suit for possession wherein both the parties have got the suit land demarcated by the two Revenue Officers. The said Revenue Officers had given the contradictory reports. The Court was of the view that unless or until there is proper demarcation, the controversy cannot be settled. Therefore, the Court *suo motu* appointed the Naib Tehsildar as Local Commissioner to demarcate the disputed property.

I am of the view that when the Court finds that it is unable to arrive at a decision on the basis of contradictory reports of the Revenue Offices, it is always open to the Court to personally inspect the spot or appoint the Local Commissioner to arrive at a conclusion.

Such power is inherent with Court and cannot be
disputed.

Hence, the present revision petition is dismissed.

August 11, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE