

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

CR No.5728 of 2015

Date of decision : 27.04.2016

Dheeraj Devi

...Petitioner

Versus

Narender Pal and another

...Respondents

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. S.P. Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sunil Panwar, Advocate for the respondents.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner-defendant is aggrieved of the judgment rendered in miscellaneous appeal, whereby ad interim application filed under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 at the instance of respondent-plaintiff has been allowed and petitioner has been restrained from raising the construction during the pendency of the suit.

Mr. S.P. Yadav, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that by that time already construction has been raised up to the third floor.

Mr. Sunil Panwar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents-plaintiff submits that respondent-plaintiff has already

concluded the evidence and two opportunities have been taken by the petitioner-defendant for leading evidence but no evidence has been led. Be that as it may, without pondering upon merits and demerits of the case and factum of the case that petitioner has already raised construction, I am of the view that no harm would be caused in case injunction granted by the lower Appellate Court is made absolute and ordered to remain valid till the adjudication of the suit, in case the petitioner-defendant concludes her evidence within a period of three months, thereafter trial Court shall decide the suit.

Nothing mentioned herein shall construed expression of merits on the matter pending adjudication before trial Court.

Revision petition stands disposed of.

27.04.2016

pawan

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**