

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

**CR No.2741 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of decision : April 30, 2018**

Rajinder

..... Petitioner

Versus

Chander Bhan and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Sumit Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vijay Kumar Jindal, Sr. Advocate with

Mr. Gopal Soni, Advocate for the respondents-Caveators.

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 22.03.2018 passed by learned Addl. District Judge, Karnal, vide which pending the hearing of the civil appeal, an application for ad interim injunction was rejected.

Heard.

It comes out that a decree for specific performance has been passed in favour of respondent No.2 and against respondent No.1. The examination of the facts shows that thereafter, as many as five suits have been filed on one or the other ground. All the suits have since been dismissed.

The lower appellate Court while exercising the discretion in such circumstances, dismissed the application for granting the temporary injunction. There is no ground to interfere in the same. At the same time, it is observed that the lower appellate Court passed about 13 pages order to dispose of the application.

I am of the view that with the same amount of energy and discussion, the main appeal could have been decided.

In these circumstances, the lower appellate Court is directed to hear the arguments on the main appeal within one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order and dispose of the same, if necessary, by pre-poning the date.

As such, the present revision petition is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

April 30, 2018

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No