

135.

**RA-CR No.200-CII of 2016 in
C.R. No.6271 of 2011**

M/s Tulika Engineers Vs. Navinder Singh Oberoi

Present: Mr. Rahul Garg, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioner.

The present application is filed seeking review of the judgment dated 08.07.2016. One of the points for dismissal of the revision petition was that the petitioner has not sought the declaration with regard to allotment of the plot in favour of the respondent-plaintiff in a suit filed at Panchkula.

Mr. Rahul Garg, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in fact, the aforementioned information could not be provided to this Court as the amendment of the suit under Order 6 Rule 17 CPC was sought and granted by the Court on 30.05.2012.

I have heard learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner. Even otherwise, if the amendment had been sought, the petitioner cannot seek the stay of the suit. The other party cannot remain remediless, in seeking the injunction qua forcible interference and dispossession. Both the suits are based upon different facts and cannot be said to be linked with each other.

I do not find any illegality in the order subjected to review. No ground for interference is made. The review application is dismissed.

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

August 08, 2016
Pankaj*