

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

C.R. No.1740 of 2016

Date of Decision.17.03.2016

Raj Bala

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Smt. Laxmi and another

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Mahender Singh Chahal, 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. In suit for specific performance for enforcement of the agreement, the plaintiff has impleaded also a subsequent agreement holder. It appears that subsequent to the institution of the suit, the agreement holder has also purchased the property. He has sought for making reference about this subsequent sale. The Court has observed that the amendment is being brought up after the plaintiff and defendants have closed their evidence and when it was posted for rebuttal evidence and arguments. The Court also observed that subsequent purchaser who will be hit by lis pendens, will not obtain any equity and therefore, the plaintiff will not be put to any hardship. If the plaintiff could show the validity of the agreement and his entitlement to secure a decree, a subsequent transaction need not be taken note of.

2. The observation of the trial Court is correct and I will find

no reason for interfering with the same. The order is sustained and the civil revision is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

March 17, 2016
Pankaj*