

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

CR No. 5639 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of decision: March 3, 2015

Gulzari Lal

...Petitioner

Versus

Shri Sanatan Dharam Mahabir Dal

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

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. Ashish Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Shrey Goel, Advocate,
for the respondent.

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

1. The counsel for the petitioner states that the notice was issued only for a limited consideration of the time that could be granted for vacating the premises in dispute. The counsel for the respondent states that the possession has already been taken and the revision petition has become infructuous.

2. The revision petition is dismissed as infructuous, in view of the statement made by the counsel for the respondent, although the petitioner has no instructions as regards the same. The petitioner shall be at liberty to seek for modification or review of the order, if the statement made by the counsel for the respondent is found to be not correct or true.

March 3, 2015
prem

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

