

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

RSA No.2200 of 2012 (O&M)

Date of Decision.11.08.2015

Rakesh Kumar

.....Appellant

Versus

Ram Chander

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. N.S. Shekhawat, Advocate
for the appellant.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

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?

-. -

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

C.M. No.6143-C of 2012

For the reasons stated in the application, delay of 12 days in filing the second appeal is condoned.

Application is allowed.

RSA No.2200 of 2012

1. The appeal is at the instance of the plaintiff whose suit for declaration of permanent injunction was dismissed and the Appellate Court also affirmed the same. The plaintiff claimed himself to be adopted son of the defendant through ceremonies alleged to have taken place on 12.11.1992. It was his plea that his biological parents had given him in adoption and the requirements of giving and taking had taken place. The plaintiff claimed himself to be a coparcener with the adopted parents and his grievance was that the defendant was acting against his interest and he was trying to create alienation. The

defendant denied that there was any such adoption and therefore, it became essential for the plaintiff to give appropriate evidence. The two Courts below held that there was no such adoption as claimed by the plaintiff and the reliefs which he was asking as a consequence to his so-called adoption could not be sustained.

2. I find no error in the decisions taken by the two courts below and would find no warrant for an interference. The second appeal is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

August 11, 2015
Pankaj*