

111

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

**Civil Revision No.5963 of 2017
Decided on: 05.09.2017**

Saloni Jindal

.....Petitioner

versus

Vikram Jindal and another

.....Respondents

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJBIR SEHRAWAT

Present: Mr.Sanjeev Manrai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Harshit Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Rajbir Sehrawat, J.(Oral)

The challenge in this revision petition is by the mother of the minor to the order dated 18.07.2017 wherein the permission has been granted by the Court to the father of the minor to dispose of the property of the minor.

However, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to this permission, respondent No.1 has already transferred the property for which the permission was granted.

In view of the situation, the present petitioner, in any case, would be required to challenge the sale deed to claim any rights qua the property, even it is to be on behalf of the minor. Therefore, this revision petition is left to be only of Academic interest and, therefore, is disposed of as infructuous with further observations that in case the petitioner challenges that sale deed then the order impugned in the present revision petition shall not be interpreted as

conferring any additional sanctity upon the father qua his right to sell the property. The nature of the sale shall be independently adjudicated upon by the Court without getting influenced by the order impugned in the present petition. If the petitioner challenges that sale deed then she will be entitled to take all the pleas available to her including the plea taken in the present revision petition and the trial Court would be at liberty to decide again the desirability of the permission to sell to the father.

Disposed of in the above terms.

Since the present petition is being treated disposed of, in view of the fact that the property has already been transferred pursuant to the present impugned order, therefore, it would be in the fitness of the things if the respondent herein is restrained from creating any third party rights qua the property involved in these proceedings, by any means, till the present petitioner files the suit challenging that sale deed. However, this period cannot be extended upto indefinite time frame. Therefore, in the facts and circumstances of the case, it is ordered that respondent No.1 shall not create any third party rights qua the property involved in the present petition for the next three months starting from today.

5th September 2017

shabha

**[RAJBIR SEHRAWAT]
JUDGE**