

116

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

Civil Revision No.8566 of 2016

Date of Decision: 19.12.2016

BHARAT BHUSHAN

.....Petitioner

Vs

KEWAL KRISHAN

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present:Mr. Arjunveer Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

[1]. Petitioner has assailed order dated 26.09.2016 (Annexure P-1) passed by Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.) Ludhiana vide which prayer made in application under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC was rejected.

[2]. Petitioner has alleged that the suit property was given to the defendant for the purposes of use and occupation and no right of the defendant was created. Suit was filed for mandatory injunction on the ground that property was given to the defendant as licensee and required court fee has been paid.

[3]. At this stage, only averments made in the plaint are to be seen. I see no error of jurisdiction in the impugned order

passed by the trial Court, nor the same is suffered with any perversity.

[4]. This revision petition is accordingly dismissed.

December 19, 2016
Atik

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No