

250.

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

Civil Revision No.2668 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of decision:12.01.2016

Hari Om and another

... Petitioners

versus

Ram Rachhpal and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr.Paras Talwar, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ? No.
2. To be referred to the reporters or not ? No.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ? No.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

A seemingly speculative suit of the plaintiff suing for injunction on an unregistered agreement was stopped midway by a person claiming as a purchaser and who has a case to contend that the very same property has been purchased by him from his vendor who had their rights adjudicated in appeal before the Supreme Court. The court has found that it will be only appropriate that the case of the plaintiff is decided in the presence of the persons who have claimed valuable right in the property itself. It assumes significance that the plaintiff has no registered document and if a

person claiming to be the owner of the property wants his own impleadment and the disposal in his presence, then it is fair enough that the court has allowed for such impleadment. I find no reason for interfering with the same. The revision petition is dismissed.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

12.01.2016
sanjeev