

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

115

Date of Decision: 14.03.2018

1. CR No.1950 of 2017 (O&M)

Ram Pal and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

Ram Singh and others

..... Respondents

2. CR No.8497 of 2017 (O&M)

Ram Pal and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

Kulwant Singh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present:- Mr. Sanjeev Patiyal, Advocate
for the petitioners (in both cases).

Mr. Hamid Hussan, Advocate
for respondent No.1 (in CR-1950-2017).

Mr. Jasbir Singh, Advocate
for respondents No.3 and 4 (in CR-1950-2017).

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (ORAL)

CR No.1950 of 2017

Vide this judgment, I shall be disposing of two revision petitions bearing CR No.1950 of 2017 titled 'Ram Pal and others Vs. Ram Singh and others' and CR No.8497 of 2017 titled 'Ram Pal and others Vs. Kulwant Singh and others'.

Petitioners filed an application under Order 1 Rule 10, CPC

claiming to be proprietors of the village in two suits filed by two different plaintiffs. The suit is for decree for declaration to the effect that the plaintiff is owner of the 7/8th share in the suit property. The petitioners-applicants filed an application claiming that they are residents of the village and being proprietors, they are interested as the property belongs to a religious institution. Learned trial Court after discussing various aspects of the case dismissed the application.

Learned counsel for the respondent-plaintiff has stated that the suit is only with respect to their personal property and is not with respect to the share of religious institution. He has also stated that the property of the religious institution is not being claimed by the plaintiff in the suit.

In view of the aforesaid statement, this Court does not find any good ground to interfere with the order passed by the Court.

Both the revision petitions are dismissed.

14.03.2018
Dinesh Bansal

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes / No

Whether Reportable Yes / No