

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

**C.R. No.2875 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision.26.04.2016**

Kanwaljit Kaur	Vs.	Petitioner
Harbhajan Kaur and others		Respondents

Present: Mr. Amit Gupta, 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. After the suit was decreed on 05.10.2012, one of the defendants filed an application under 23 Rule 3 CPC to seek for an adjudication that the alleged compromise on the basis of which a decree was passed was fabricated and the signature found in the compromise was obtained from him by fraud and deception on blank stamp papers. An application was also filed under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 CPC for injunction against the plaintiff restraining the defendant from giving effect to the compromise. There is no prima facie case for such consideration and if it was dismissed by the court below, there is no need for modification. The adjudication of whether the compromise was valid or not, will ultimately decide the petitioner's right and he will not be in any way affect by an interim order passed in the application under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 CPC.

2. The revision petition is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

April 26, 2016