

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 2208 of 2016
Date of decision : March 29, 2016

Jai Lal and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

Tek Chand and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

**Present:- Mr. Bhupinder Singh Bairagi, Advocate
for the petitioners.**

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?

Amit Rawal, J (oral).

The petitioners-applicants are aggrieved against the order dated 15.3.2016 whereby application under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC in a suit for possession of agricultural land between the plaintiffs and defendants has been dismissed.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that the possession of the property sought through process of the court is in possession of the petitioners, though, along with the application, copy of the rent receipt has not been produced but the same has now been shown through entries in the jamabandi for the year 1943-44 (Annexure P-4). The trial court has declined the application by holding that the application is not

accompanied by documentary evidence, thus urges this court for setting aside of the impugned order.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners, appraised the paper book and of the view that there is no substance in the aforementioned submissions, for the reason that in case the petitioners are aggrieved of any threat of forcible dis-possession, they are at liberty to seek the remedy, in accordance with law and not by moving the application as the suit has reached the stage of rebuttal evidence and the application was not accompanied by documentary evidence.

I do not find any illegality and perversity in the impugned order and the same cannot be said to have been passed without jurisdiction.

The revision petition is devoid of merits. Accordingly the same is dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

March 29, 2016
archana