

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

254

Civil Revision No.6150 of 2014

Date of Decision:21.04.2015

Neetu

.....petitioner

Versus

M/s Landmark Apartments Pvt.Ltd. & others

.....Respondents

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

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

Present: Mr.Sudhir Aggarwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr.S.S.Mor, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.

K.KANNAN, J.(oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that respondent No.1 is only contesting respondent and other respondents are merely proforma.

Notice to other respondents is dispensed with.

The fourth plaintiff shown as minor according to defendant is major. The application was filed to discharge the guardian and treated her as major. This was surprisingly contested and a greater surprise that a Judge allowed the objection to prevail. I do not find the order tenable and set it aside. The guardian is discharged and the fourth plaintiff is permitted to be treated as major.

The revision petition is allowed.

April 21, 2015
seema

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE