

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

227

CR No.2484 of 2015 (O & M)
Date of Decision:21.03.2018

Kulwinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Rajinder Singh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate
for the respondent.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.(Oral)

Plaintiff-petitioner is in the revision petition against the order passed by the learned trial Court appointing a Local Commissioner to demarcate the suit property and submit his report as to whether the property described in the site plan as well as in the plaint is part of Khasra Nos.1642 and 1644 or not?

Learned counsel for the petitioner-plaintiff has vehemently argued that the plaintiff in Para 1 of the plaint had specifically asserted that the property in dispute falls in the aforesaid khasra numbers. He has also drawn the attention of the Court to Para 1 of the written statement, wherein it is recorded that contents of Para 1 of the plaint are matter of record and the plaintiff be put to strict proof of the same. It was further recorded that description of the land has not been correctly given by the plaintiff in the plaint.

This Court has heard the arguments of learned counsel for the

Learned trial Court has only appointed Local Commissioner to demarcate the land and report whether the property described in the site plan as well as in the plaint is part of the aforesaid khasra numbers or not?

In the considered opinion of this Court, such order does not prejudice anyone. The learned trial Court is well within its power to get the local investigation carried out so as to arrive at a correct conclusion.

Hence, the revision petition is dismissed.

21.03.2018
sheetal

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No