

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Date of Decision: December 14, 2015

1. C.R.No.5316 of 2014 (O&M)

Ishwar Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Kulwant Singh & others

...Respondents

2. C.R.No.2855 of 2015

Ishwar Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Kulwant Singh & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL, JUDGE

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?

Present: Mr.Vikram Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner in both the cases.

Mr.S.S.Khurana, Advocate,
for respondent No.1 in CR No.5316 of 2014

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

By this order, I intend to dispose of two Civil Revision
Nos.5316 of 2014 and 2855 of 2015.

Civil Revision No.5316 of 2014 is at the instance of petitioner
against the order dated 21.7.2014, whereby, the status-quo granted in the
application filed under Order 39 Rule 1 & 2 CPC by the trial Court, has
been set-aside by the Lower Appellate Court, whereas Civil Revision
No.2855 of 2015 has been filed by the petitioner against the order dated

17.4.2015 passed by the Lower Appellate Court, whereby the appeal filed

against the order dated 20.3.2015 granted stay, has been dismissed.

Mr. Vikram Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the suit is at the stage of final hearing and his client would be satisfied in case an appropriate direction is issued to the trial Court to expedite the disposal of the suit. He further submits that the trial Court found that the parties to the lis were in exclusive possession of the suit property and rightly entertained the application by granting status-quo, whereas Kulwant Singh respondent No.1, during the pendency of the suit, filed another suit seeking injunction against the petitioner vis-a-vis the same property.

I have gone through the impugned order in which detailed reasons have been given while disposing of the application that as per the report of the Local Commissioner, certain construction has been taken place after the property has been sold by one co-sharer to Kulwant Singh, subsequent vendee, however, during the interregnum, respondent No.1 Kulwant Singh completed the construction.

I am of the opinion that since the suit has reached at the stage of final arguments, the trial Court shall decide the case as expeditiously as possible, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

It is made clear that any construction raised by respondent No.1 shall be at his peril.

With the aforementioned observations, the revision petitions stand disposed of.

December 14, 2015
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE