

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

C.R. No.137 of 2016

Date of Decision.13.01.2016

Sadhu Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Ram Singh and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Tribhawan Singla, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

**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 who obtained an order of injunction in respect of the land complained that within the said land was also a tubewell room and connection that is being held by the respondent and therefore, police protection must be given to secure the benefit of injunction. The defendant countered it saying that the plaintiff has obtained an order of injunction in relation to the property of which he is not even in possession of and he cannot secure the police protection for gaining entry into the tubewell room. The Court has observed that if he had benefit of injunction for the land, the issue of whether he should be protected by police must be considered from the point of view of evidence of whether he was in possession of the property or not. The Court has, therefore, declined the police protection.

2. The order passed is well reasoned and there is nothing illegal for interference in revision petition. The revision petition is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)  
JUDGE**

**January 13, 2016**  
Pankaj\*