

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

**CR No.4518 of 2015
Date of decision:23.02.2016**

Ram Karan

... Petitioner

Vs.

Ram Sarup

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment?
2. To be referred to reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present:- Mr. Shilak Ram Hooda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. S.S.Salar, Advocate
for the respondent.

AMIT RAWAL J. (Oral)

The petitioner-defendant is aggrieved of the order dated 06.07.2015, passed by the Lower Appellate Court, disposing of the civil miscellaneous appeal filed by the plaintiff, whereby, an application under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, has been allowed. The defendant has been restrained from blocking the site/passage in dispute, by any mode, marked with letters 'ABCD' in the site plan attached with the plaint and also marked with letters 'GH' in the site plan Annexure D1 till the pendency of the suit before the trial Court.

This Court, vide order dated 21.07.2015, while issuing

notice of motion, had directed to maintain status quo regarding the property in dispute. The dispute is amongst the real brothers. The suit is at the stage of plaintiff's evidence

Mr. S.S.Salar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent submits that only one witness has to be examined and shall make endeavor to conclude the plaintiff's evidence, as early as possible.

Keeping in view the aforementioned submission, the present revision is disposed of, with a direction to the trial Court to expedite the trial, as early as possible. However, in the meantime, both the parties shall maintain status quo qua suit property as it exists today, till the adjudication of the dispute/suit.

Accordingly, revision petition stands disposed of.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

February 23, 2016
savita