

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

PARAMJIT KAUR SAINI
2016.05.03 14:42
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

Civil Revision No.1678 of 2016

Date of Decision: 2.5.2016

Nand Lal

--- Petitioner

versus

Udai Ram deceased through Lrs. Virender Singh and others

---Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

Present: None for the petitioner
Mr. S.S.Khurana, Advocate for Lrs of respondent No. 1

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Rekha Mittal, J.

On 29.4.2016, following order was passed:-

“There is no representation on behalf of respondents No. 2 to 4 despite their service.

Mr. S.S.Khuran, Advocate, has caused appearance on behalf of legal representatives of respondent No. 1 and has apprised the Court that the execution petition has been withdrawn as fully satisfied.

Arguing counsel for the petitioner is not present and counsel present on behalf of the petitioner prays for a short accommodation to seek instructions.

Adjourned to 2.5.2016.”

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

In view of statement made by counsel for legal representatives of respondent No. 1, the petition stands disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to seek revival, if need be.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

2.5.2016
PARAMJIT