

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

RSA No.1747 of 2013 (O&M)

Date of Decision: December 11, 2015

Surinder Kaur and another

.... Appellants

vs.

Manjit Kaur

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate for the appellants.

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 regular second appeal is the judgment and decree dated 10.01.2013 passed by learned District Judge, Jalandhar, affirming the judgment and decree dated 06.01.2012 passed by learned Addl. Civil judge (Sr. Divn.), Phillaur, vide which the suit of the plaintiff for permanent injunction was decreed and defendants were permanently restrained from raising any construction, pillar or creating any sort of obstruction in front of the house of the plaintiff or obstructing the *parwalas* (a drain from the roof of the house) of the house of the plaintiff into the public street shown read marked ABCD in the site plan, illegally and forcibly.

I have heard learned counsel for the appellants and have also carefully gone through the case file.

A perusal of findings of both the courts below shows that both the courts have found that the defendants cannot raise any pillar or construction in front of the house of the plaintiff nor they can obstruct the out flow of the water of the house of the plaintiff. The findings of facts have been recorded by both the courts below. No substantial question of law is involved in the present appeal.

Hence, the present regular second appeal stands dismissed.

December 11, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE