

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

RSA No.2244 of 2015

Date of Decision: December 11, 2015

Shanti Devi

.... Appellant

vs.

Gian Singh and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Liaqat Ali, Advocate for the appellant.

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 19.12.2014 passed by learned Addl. District Judge, Jalandhar, affirming the judgment and decree dated 17.10.2012 passed by learned Civil judge (Sr. Divn.), Jalandhar, vide which the suit of the plaintiff for permanent injunction was dismissed.

The plaintiff has claimed permanent injunction, stating that she had purchased the disputed plot from Model Line Colonizers, Proprietor S.I. Bricks and Builders Pvt. Ltd. in the year 1973, after paying the value of the plot.

On the other hand, defendant Nos.2 and 3 claimed that they had purchased the property bearing No.131, 132 and 133 from defendant No.1, vide sale deed dated 17.05.2007, who was having power of attorney to sell the said property.

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

Before the lower court, the defendants had produced their sale deed. However, the plaintiff failed to produce any document to prove that the plot was sold to her. Nobody from the Model Line Colonizer was examined to prove that the said plot was ever sold to the plaintiff.

In this way, left is the only oral testimony accompanying by ration card, which was issued just about fortnight before the filing of the present suit. The said ration card was discarded by the lower court.

It comes out that the findings of facts have been recorded by both the courts below. The plaintiff had failed to prove her possession and title over the disputed plot. 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