

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

CR No.5476 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of decision : 07.04.2016

M/s Patiyala Kargo Road Lines Ltd.

...Petitioner

Versus

Ash Mohd.

...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. Sajjan Singh Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that revision petition is against the order allowing the application filed under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 in pending suit which was passed on 08.01.2013. The interim injunction is causing irreparable loss and, therefore, liable to be set aside.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and appraised the paper book.

Suit seeking declaration and permanent injunction was instituted on 19.10.2012. Ad interim application was decided on 08.01.2013. It would not be appropriate to interfere with the findings rendered by the lower Court in 2016. It has been informed during hearing

that the suit is at the stage of defendant's evidence thus, I deem it appropriate to direct the trial Court to decide the suit as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of six months.

Impugned orders are affirmed.

In view of the aforementioned direction, revision petition stands disposed of.

07.04.2016

pawan

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**