

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Civil Revision No. 6209 of 2014 (O&M)

DATE OF DECISION : December 08, 2015

Sunil Kumar

..... PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

Satish & ors.

.... RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Manoj Makkar, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. V.S. Punia, Advocate, for the respondents.

...

1. Whether Reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment? YES/NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? YES/NO

3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest? YES/NO

...

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

The present revision arises out of an application for injunction moved by the plaintiff-petitioner under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

In an application moved by the plaintiff-petitioner, he prayed that the defendant-respondents be enjoined from alienating the suit land. However, vide order dated 05.09.2013,

the application moved by the plaintiff-petitioner was dismissed. As even an appeal preferred against the said order failed and was dismissed vide judgment dated 05.05.2014, plaintiff is before this Court.

Concededly, respondents are the owners of the suit property and any sale/alienation by them during the pendency of the suit, as observed even by the 1st Appellate Court, shall be hit by the principle of lis pendence. And, if there ever is any occasion for the respondents to alienate the suit land, there shall be a specific reference in the sale deed as regards pendency of the lis between the parties in the present suit.

Accordingly, no interference is warranted in exercise of revisional jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. Petition being devoid of merit is, accordingly, dismissed.

DECEMBER 08, 2015
Kang

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE