

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

C.R. No. 8136 of 2016

Date of Decision: January 12, 2017.

Sushila Devi

....Petitioner

Versus

Geeta and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Mr.Babbar Bhan, Advocate for Mr.O.P.Dhankar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Rajan Gupta, J (Oral)

Present revision petition emanates from an order passed by the trial court whereby application moved by the petitioner for interim injunction has been rejected. Plaintiff claims that her real sister namely, Malti Devi sold the house to her for a consideration of Rs. 5 lacs before her death on 15.3.2010. Thus, she had become owner of the property and could not be dispossessed. Plaintiff was not able to place on record any document in support of this plea. Nor any proof regarding payment of Rs.5 lacs as considerations was produced. As a result, her application for interim injunction was declined. Order was upheld by the appellate court. I am not inclined to interfere in the revisional jurisdiction. Dismissed. It is, however, directed that trial court would endeavour to conclude the trial expeditiously. Nothing said herein-above shall have bearing on the merits of the case.

**(Rajan Gupta)
Judge**

12.1.2017

BB

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No