

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

**C.R. No.80 of 2016 (O&M)  
Date of Decision.11.01.2016**

Jaipal

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Ganga Saran

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

**CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN**

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?

-.-

**K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)**

1. There is no scope for intervention in order rejecting an application through the revision petition. The revision petition itself is not competent even on substantial ground of whether the suit could not have been maintained in the year 2012 for assailing the sale deed which was said to have been executed on 18.11.2005. It is patently barred by limitation. The plaintiff himself had filed suit on 01.09.2007 with reference to the very same subject matter but had the suit withdrawn. Order 23 Rule 2 CPC states that the permission for withdrawal will not save the claim from being barred by limitation. The fresh suit was clearly barred and there is no merit in the revision petition.

2. The revision petition is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)  
JUDGE**

**January 11, 2016  
Pankaj\***