

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

CR No. 184 of 2013 (O&M)
Date of decision: April 5, 2016

Kashi Nath

...Petitioner

Versus

Seema Bhateja and others

...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?**

Present: Mr. ND Achint, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Jain, Advocate,
for the respondents.

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

CM No. 70 CII of 2016

1. For the reasons stated in the application, the revision is restored to its original file.

Main case

2. The revision petition is against the order directing entry into property which is claimed by the petitioner as already in his possession. There is no basis for such assumption. Except the statement of the petitioner that he was co-heir at law, there is nothing brought on record that he was in exclusive possession of Shop No. 89/8. The order of status quo does not reveal in respect of what property it is being passed. Even the

police protection to preserve the status quo cannot be understood as affirmation by the court that the petitioner is in possession of the property.

There can be no direction for delivery to the plaintiff. The court below has not granted such relief. I find no ground to interfere.

3. The revision petition is dismissed.

April 5, 2016
prem

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE