

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

C.R. No.3340 of 2016

Date of Decision.11.05.2016

Ravinder son of Mugla

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Sansar

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Ramesh Sharma, 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. The relief of injunction has been declined to the plaintiff, for, according to the petitioner, a reason that the defendant has himself filed a suit for abatement of nuisance and the plaintiff has filed the present suit and sought for injunction only out of ill-will. I will not go into an issue of whether there was an ill-will or the motivation for causing the obstruction but if I must examine whether the plaintiff has a prima facie case to show his title to the property and his right of enjoyment over the property over which he is seeking for restraint, I find none.

2. I find no reason for making an intervention with the order declining injunction. The counsel for the petitioner says that the case must be disposed of expeditiously and direction to that effect may be given. The petitioner may use all his resourcefulness before the trial Court for an expeditious disposal and the trial Court will consider the

same in the manner which is appropriate and just. The revision petition is dismissed with the above observations.

**(K. KANNAN)**  
**JUDGE**

**May 11, 2016**  
**Pankaj\***