

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

RSA No.565 of 1993
Date of decision : 21.10.2015

Gurbachan Singh and ors.

...Appellants

Versus

Bikram Singh (deceased) through Lrs

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL.

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment ?
2. To be referred to reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present: Ms. Alka Sarin, Advocate for appellants.

Mr. Gurcharan Singh, Advocate for
Sukhminder Kaur and Barjinder Kaur
(LRs of respondent Nos.1 & 2)

Mr. Aashish Chopra, Advocate for respondent No.4.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

Both the parties are ad idem that matter before Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court has been settled and, therefore, present regular second appeal be disposed of in terms of said settlement.

In view of statement made by learned counsel for parties, present regular second appeal is disposed of in terms of said settlement.

In the agreement, due to inadvertence in Sub Clause (a) of Clause 7, it could not be mentioned that piece of land measuring 3.5 Killas would be contiguous or adjacent to the land already owned by Harjit Kaur which is adjacent to room, therefore, aforementioned fact as noticed could not be mentioned in compromise as there is no ambiguity/defect in seeking

implementation of the compromise.

In view of aforementioned facts, parties shall be bound by the terms and conditions of the compromise and as well as of the aforementioned observation which have been noticed on the joint statement made by the learned counsel for parties to the lis.

Compromise and the aforementioned observation be made part of the order of the decree sheet.

21.10.2015

pawan

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**