

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 2578 of 2017 (O/M)

Date of decision : 4.4.2018

Lakhwinder Singh and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

Mukhtiar Singh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. V.K. Kaushal, Advocate, for petitioners.

Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate, for respondents No. 1 to 3.

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 present revision is order dated 16.9.2016 (Annexure-P-1), passed by the learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Amritsar, vide which an application filed by present petitioner under Section 11 CPC, 1908 was dismissed.

Heard.

The perusal of impugned order shows that the Court while taking note of previous suit for permanent injunction has held that issue No. 7 has already been framed on the question of res judicata and matter is to be decided after recording evidence.

I am of the view that matter is pending and yet to be decided after recording evidence. There is no ground to interfere in impugned order. Consequently, revision is dismissed. Since main case has been dismissed, therefore, pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

4.4.2018

sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes / No
Whether Reportable : Yes / No