

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

CR No.8803 of 2015

Date of Decision: December 23, 2015

Santosh Kumari and another

.... Petitioners

vs.

Pardeep Khurana and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Atul Goyal, Advocate for the petitioners.

1. *Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 06.10.2015 (Annexure P-6) passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Ludhiana, vide which the application of the petitioner filed under Order VII, Rule 11 CPC for rejection of the plaint was dismissed.

The plaint was sought to be rejected on the ground that the plaintiff has no valid cause of action to file the suit and it is not properly valued.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have also properly gone through the copy of the plaint.

A perusal of the plaint shows that a relief of declaration and in the alternative relief of separate possession along with permanent injunction was sought by the plaintiff. The plaint *prima*

facie itself disclosed the cause of action. The evidence to be produced by the plaintiff before the lower court cannot be prejudged at the stage of filing of the suit itself. Thus, there is no ground to interfere in the impugned order.

Accordingly, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

December 23, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE