

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

C.R. No.426 of 2016

Date of Decision.11.03.2016

Pirithi	Vs.	Petitioner
State of Haryana and another		Respondents

Present: Mr. Manish Soni, 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. Pending suit for injunction, the petitioner sought for interlocutory relief of injunction against the respondent from evicting the petitioner. There has already been an order of eviction. While an order of injunction can be granted to protect possession till evicted by due process, this cannot be utilized where due process has been adopted and an order of eviction has been obtained. An interim injunction sought was, therefore, not tenable at all. The claim for injunction now is that some other persons who had also been evicted, have been regularized by government orders. If there are circumstances that can show that other persons similarly situate had the benefit of allotment of the property or their possession was regularized, the petitioner is at liberty to take such action and seek for appropriate remedies in the manner known to law.

2. With these observations, the civil revision is disposed of.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

March 11, 2016
Pankaj*