

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR No.629 of 2014(O&M)
Date of decision: 15.10.2015

Bachan Kaur and another

... Petitioners

Versus

Kashmir Singh and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. VK Sandhir, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Vipul Jindal, Advocate for the respondents.

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?

ARUN PALLI J. (Oral)

Suit filed by the plaintiffs was dismissed by the trial court. Being aggrieved against the said decree plaintiffs preferred an appeal i.e. purportedly pending before the first appellate court. As an application for injunction moved before the first appellate court was dismissed, vide order being assailed in the present revision, dated 08.01.2014, plaintiffs are before this court vide this revision.

While issuing notice of motion this court, on 29.01.2014, had restrained the respondents from alienating the suit property. Concededly, the said order is in operation even today. Learned counsel for the parties submit that since the appeal before the first appellate court is pending

consideration for the past two years, the petition be disposed of with a direction to the first appellate court to decide the same within a specified time and in the interregnum the respondents shall not alienate the suit property.

That being so, without examining the dispute on merits, the petition is disposed of with a direction to the first appellate court to consider and decide Civil Appeal No.28831 of 2013, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of three months from the receipt of certified copy of this order. As agreed, respondents shall not alienate the suit property during the pendency of the appeal before the first appellate court.

October 15, 2015
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge