

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 89 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : January 11, 2016

Kuldeep Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Deva Singh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. A. S. 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 submits that the suit is for injunction directing the co-sharers that they should not interfere into the peaceful possession of the plaintiff and as well as for dispossession.

Since the parties admittedly are co-sharers, the remedy if any, is to seek partition and not interim relief. Rightly so, the courts below have dismissed the application under Order 39 Rule 1 and 2 CPC.

Confronted with the situation, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that his client would seek remedy in accordance with law and seek interim relief. Therefore, he seeks

withdrawal of the revision petition.

Ordered accordingly.

The revision petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

January 11, 2016
archana