

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

CWP No. 5372-2002

Date of Decision: 25.02.2015

Misro

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARAMJEET SINGH

- 1) Whether Reporters of the 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. Santosh Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep S. Mann, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Harsh Aggarwal, Advocate,
for respondents no.5 to 7.

Paramjeet Singh, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for respondents no.5 to 7 states that since petitioner-Misro has sold the disputed land vide registered sale deed No.3385 dated 26.11.2010, therefore, instant petition has become infructuous. Photocopy in vernacular of the sale deed is taken on record.

Dismissed as infructuous.

If the statement of learned counsel for respondents no.5 to 7 is found to be incorrect, the petitioner will be at liberty to move appropriate application for revival of the petition.

25.02.2015
parveen kumar

(Paramjeet Singh)
Judge