

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

C.R. No.1388 of 2013 (O&M)

Date of Decision.22.03.2016

Gurdev Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Kulwant Singh and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Paras Talwar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

None for the respondents.

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)

C.M. No.1682-CII of 2016

For the reasons stated in the application, delay of 6 days in
filing the application for restoration is condoned.

Application is allowed.

C.M. No.1683-CII of 2016

For the reasons stated in the application, order passed by
this Court on 17.12.2015 is recalled and the revision petition is restored
to its original number.

Application is allowed.

C.R. No.1388 of 2013

1. The description of property which is sought to be brought in
for 350 sq. yards is wholly inconsequential to the relief which is claimed.

The property of 55 sq. yards had been claimed to be in the possession of

the defendant. The property measuring 55 sq. yards which is said to be wrongly possessed by the defendant is properly described by boundaries and there is enough certainty for identifying the property for which the relief is sought. If the Appellate Court has not found it necessary to entertain an application for amendment for giving boundaries for larger extent, I find that there is nothing wrong and the petitioner is not likely to get in any way prejudiced.

2. The revision petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

March 22, 2016
Pankaj*