
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

[236]

Civil Revision No.5132 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 05.11.2015.

Sohan Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Mukhtiar Singh and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Balbir Singh Saini, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Pankaj Bali, Advocate,
for the respondents.

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)

Impugned in the present revision is order dated 19.05.2014, passed by the learned Civil Judge, Junior Division, Khanna, vide which the application of the petitioner to appoint Local Commissioner to report about the actual and factual position of the suit property was dismissed.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have also carefully gone through the file.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in fact

after the stay order some construction was made regarding which the report was required.

I am of the view that if some construction has been made, the plaintiff would always lead other evidence in the form of photographs or some other witnesses or expert to prove about the construction and its age. The Lower Court has already exercised its discretion by not appointing the Local Commissioner for such purpose of reporting the actual and factual position of the disputed property. There is no ground to interfere in the same.

Revision stands dismissed.

November 05, 2015

Ankur

**(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE**