

208 -2

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR-7588-2014 (O&M)

Date of decision : 23.04.2016

Sukhninder Kaur @ Sukhninder Colar

... Petitioner

Versus

Satvinderpal Singh Shoker and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. Vikas Bahl, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Balpreet Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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?

AMIT RAWAL, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that no cause of action survives in the present revision petition as the counter claim has already been dismissed.

In view of the aforementioned facts, the revision petition is rendered infructuous and accordingly, disposed of. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to revive, in case, information provided to them found to be incorrect.

Disposed of, accordingly.

23.04.2016
yogesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE