

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

RSA No. 1436 of 2015
Date of decision : November 6, 2015

Baldev Kaur

..... Petitioner

Versus

Narinder Singh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Vijay Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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?

Amit Rawal, J (oral).

The challenge in the present appeal is to the concurrent finding of fact whereby the appellant-plaintiff sought declaration/permanent injunction that he has become owner by way of adverse possession.

It is a settled law that the plea of adverse possession cannot be taken as a shield.

Both the courts below have concurrently held that the suit was not maintainable.

I do not intend to differ with the finding rendered by both the courts below which is based on appreciation of oral and documentary evidence. I do not find any illegality or perversity in the aforementioned judgment and decree of the appellate court.

No substantial question of law arise for determination by this Court.

In view of what has been observed above, the appeal is devoid of merits, accordingly, the same is dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

November 6 , 2015
archana