

212

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

**RSA-4413-2012 (O&M)
Date of decision : 23.08.2016**

Harwinder Singh and another

... Appellants

Versus

Municipal Corporation, Patiala

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. Raajan Soni, Advocate for
Mr. Ashish Verma, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. H.P.S. Ghuman, Advocate
for the respondent.

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)

The appellants-plaintiffs are aggrieved of the concurrent findings of fact, whereby the claim in the suit seeking permanent injunction from forcible interference and dispossession on the basis of the tile, has been dismissed by both the Courts below.

After addressing the arguments for sometime, learned counsel for the appellant submits that he may be permitted to withdraw the appeal and as well as the suit with liberty to claim the damages against erstwhile owners.

In view of the aforementioned statement, the appeal is ordered

to be dismissed as withdraw and as well as the suit. However, the liberty is granted to the appellants-plaintiffs to claim the damages against the respondent-defendant, if permissible in law.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

23.08.2016
yogesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/ No
	✓
Whether Reportable	Yes/ No