

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

Civil Revision No.588 of 2016  
Date of Decision: January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2016

Sukhwinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Nirmal Singh & others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL, JUDGE**

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?

Present: Mr.Harsh Bunger, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

**AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)**

Petitioner-defendant No.2 is aggrieved of the dismissal of the application seeking adjournment of the suit sine-die.

Mr.Harsh Bunger, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner-defendant No.2 submits that the suit instituted by the respondent-plaintiffs is for separate possession by way of partition of joint Khata and for permanent injunction seeking restraint order against the defendants, whereas issue regarding title is pending before the Court at Jalandhar and unless and until the suit is not decided, the same should be adjourned sine-die and in this regard, application has been filed, whereas the trial Court has wrongly dismissed the same without going into the contents of the suit and as well as the application.

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

The trial Court found that the suit for declaration was filed by defendant No.2, which was dismissed in default in the year 2004 and thereafter application for restoration was also dismissed on 18.9.2014. The trial Court also formed an opinion that no appeal vis-a-vis the question of title was pending, therefore, the application was totally misplaced.

I do not intend to differ with the findings rendered by the trial Court. There is no merit in the revision petition. The same is accordingly dismissed.

**January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2016**  
**ramesh**

**( AMIT RAWAL )**  
**JUDGE**