

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

**CR No.1801 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : March 01, 2018**

Balbir Kaur and others Petitioners

Versus

Preeta and others Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Jagram Singh Cooner, Advocate for the petitioners.

Dr. Mewa Singh, Advocate for respondent No.1.

Mr. Ashwani Kumar Saini, DAG, Haryana.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 08.11.2016 (Annexure P-1) passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Kalka, vide which while disposing of the application filed by the plaintiff-respondent under Order XXXIX Rule 1 and 2 read with Section 151 CPC, 1908, the parties were directed to maintain the status quo regarding the possession, alienation as well as construction of the suit property till the final disposal of the suit. The said order was upheld by the learned Addl. District Judge, Panchkula, vide order dated 21.01.2017 (Annexure P-2).

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have also carefully gone through the case file.

The short prayer of the petitioners-defendants is that they have already raised construction over the portion of the disputed property. They only seek time to complete the plaster work.

In these circumstances, the impugned order stands amended to the effect that the present petitioners be allowed to plaster the construction already raised by them and thereafter, the status quo shall remain in force till the disposal of the suit.

As such, the present revision petition is disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

March 01, 2018

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No