

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

C.R.No.1116 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: February 15, 2016

Paramjeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Gurmeet Singh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL, JUDGE

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?

**Present: Mr.Kartar Singh Malik-I, Advocate,
for the petitioner.**

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner-plaintiff is aggrieved of the dismissal of the application under Order 39 Rule 1 & 2 of the Civil Procedure Code by both the Courts below filed in a suit for permanent and mandatory injunction that he should not be dispossessed, except in due course of law.

Both the Courts below have arrived at a finding that the plaintiff himself is a witness to the sale deed bearing No.1009 dated 9.5.2001, wherein it has been shown that the possession has been handed over to the defendant. In these circumstances, the Courts below found that no balance of convenience was tilting in his favour and no irreparable loss would be caused in case the injunction is declined. The appellant-plaintiff shall be at liberty to prove the possession in accordance with law, but not in the manner and mode as has been adopted.

There is no ground for interference. The impugned order cannot be said to have been passed without jurisdiction.

The revision petition is accordingly dismissed.

**February 15 , 2016
ramesh**

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**