

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

**C.R. No.966 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision.09.02.2016**

Sanjeev Kumar Sethi

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Smt. Ram Piari through LRs and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Ramesh Kumar Bamal, 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. The discretionary order of allowing for restoration is the subject of challenge in revision petition. I do not think any serious prejudice could be said to have been caused when the suit is for specific performance and rights to immovable property would require to be adjudicated upon.

2. I do not find any illegality for inteference. The revision petition is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

**February 09, 2016
Pankaj***