

**CM No. 5975-C of 2016 in/and
CM No. 12173-C of 2014 in/and
RSA No. 3823 of 2012**

1

ARCHANA ARORA
2016.05.18 10:30
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH
CM No. 5975-C of 2016 in/and
CM No. 12173-C of 2014 in/and
RSA No. 3823 of 2012
Date of decision : May 9, 2016**

Dalbir Singh @ Balbir Singh and another

..... Appellants

Versus

Jagtar Singh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. K.P. S. Sandhu, Advocate
for the appellant.

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).
CM No. 5975-C of 2016

For the reasons stated in the application, application
is allowed.

The application bearing No.12173-C of 2014 is
restored back to its original number.

CM No. 12173-C of 2014

For the reasons stated in the application, application
is allowed.

The appeal is restored back to its original number.

RSA No. 3823 of 2012

The appellants-defendants are aggrieved of the

decretal of the suit seeking possession of land measuring 8 Kanals bearing khasra No.56/14.

Learned counsel for the appellants submits that father of the defendants namely Karnail Singh along with Joginder Singh and Gian Singh were owners in possession of the land during their life time on the basis of exchange deed dated 2.3.1959. Even they acquired the ownership by way of adverse possession. The possession of aforementioned persons is open, continuous, notorious and without any break, much less animus possendendi, thus ingredients of adverse possession have totally been proved, yet the courts below decreed the suit, thus urges this court to formulate substantial questions of law for determination by this Court.

I have heard learned counsel for the appellant and appraised the paper book and of the view that once the jamabandi reflects the status of the appellant being tenant, the tenant cannot acquire right of ownership, rightly so the suit for possession has been decreed as indisputably the respondents-plaintiffs are owners of the property in dispute. The judgment was rendered by the trial court on 28.9.2011 and there was no interim stay during that period. Presumably, the decree must have been executed by now.

I do not intend to differ with the finding rendered by both the courts below which is based on appreciation of oral and documentary evidence. There is no illegality or perversity in the aforementioned judgments and decrees of the courts below.

No substantial question of law arise for

**CM No. 5975-C of 2016 in/and
CM No. 12173-C of 2014 in/and
RSA No. 3823 of 2012**

3

determination by this Court.

In view of what has been observed above, the appeal is devoid of merits, accordingly, the same is dismissed.

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

**May 9 , 2016
archana**