

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

Civil Revision No.6624 of 2010 (O&M)

Date of decision:29.05.2015

Radha Krishan (deceased, through his LRs) ... Petitioner

versus

Subash Chander Respondent

II. Civil Revision No.4088 of 2014 (O&M)

Rakesh Kumar Kataria ... Petitioner

versus

Subhash Chander Respondent

III. Civil Revision No.3803 of 2014 (O&M)

Rakesh Kumar Kataria ... Petitioner

versus

Subhash Chander Respondent

IV. CRM-M No.19776 of 2014 (O&M)

Rakesh Kumar Kataria ... Petitioner

versus

Subhash Chander Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajay Jain, Advocate,
for the respondent.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ? No.
2. To be referred to the reporters or not ? No.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ? No.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

Civil Revision Nos.6624 of 2010, 4088 and 3803 of 2014

1. The counsel for the landlord in the above cases states that possession has been handed over by way of settlement outside court by the respective tenants and the revision petitions have since become infructuous. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

2. The petitions are dismissed as having become infructuous on the basis of submissions made by the counsel for the landlord. The petitioners will be at liberty to approach this court for a review, if there is any mis-statement or if there is any factor that vitiates the settlement.

CRM-M No.19776 of 2014

3. The above said case for initiating action under Section 340 Cr.P.C. is also disposed of as having become infructuous.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

29.05.2015
sanjeev