

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

-.-

CR 185 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of decision:20.01.2016

Savitri Maan and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

Jai Singh and others

.....Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

-.-

Present: Mr. B S Bedi, Advocate
for the petitioners

Mr. R S Longia, Advocate
for 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. (Oral)

Counsel for the petitioners states that as the petitioners did not claim any relief against respondents No. 2 to 9 in the present petition, their service may be dispensed with.

Ordered accordingly.

Challenge in the present petition is made against the order dated 04.01.2014 passed by the Civil Judge (Junior Division) Kurukshetra whereby the application filed by the petitioners under Order 22 Rule 10 and Order 1, Rule 10 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, has been disposed of.

A perusal of the impugned order would reveal that the Court below has dismissed the plea of the petitioners, primarily, on the ground that they have not placed on record sale deeds purported to be executed in their favour during pendency of the proceedings.

Counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that the petition may be disposed of with liberty to the petitioners to file a fresh application supported by copies of sale deeds which may be decided by the Court below in view of respective contentions of the parties, to be raised before the Court.

In view of the above, the petition stands disposed of with liberty to the petitioners to file a fresh application for impleading them as a party supported by copies of sale deeds propounded by them which shall be disposed by the Court below, after hearing counsel for the parties, in accordance with law, without being prejudiced by any observations made in the impugned order.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

20.01.2016
mohan