

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

**RSA No.1952 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of Decision.03.11.2015**

Lal Chand

.....Appellant

Versus

Smt. Sheela Rani alias Leela Devi and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Arvind Kashyap, 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)

1. The plaintiff in the suit was unable to prove his possession with reference to the property. The only argument made before this Court is that the 3rd defendant filed suit with reference to very same subject matter and it was dealt with simultaneously and her suit was also dismissed. The dismissal of the suit of the 3rd defendant could not hardly be a ground for allowing the decree sought by the plaintiff if he was unable to prove his own possession. The counsel refers to me a document which had come about subsequent to the institution of the suit showing payment of house tax and water tax. The documents found subsequent to the suit cannot aid the plaintiff to prove his possession. If the suit is dismissed, I will take to be an adjudication on point of fact on the basis of documentary and oral evidence given by the plaintiff.

2. I find no substantial question of law for consideration in the second appeal. The second appeal is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

November 03, 2015