

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

CR-3836-2014 (O&M)

Date of decision : 24.4.2018

Munish Sharma

..... Petitioner

Versus

Dalip Kaur and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

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

Ms. Promila Nain, Advocate for the respondents.

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)

Heard.

It comes out that respondents had earlier filed a civil suit for permanent injunction bearing Civil Suit No. 172 dated 6.7.2013. Later on, realizing that the plaintiffs-respondents are required to challenge the judgment and decree, filed another comprehensive suit for declaration and permanent injunction on 8.11.2013 registered as CS-0036899/2013 in which in addition to the declaration, an injunction was also sought. The said second suit was sought to be dismissed in an application filed under Order VII Rule 11 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908.

It comes out that in the previous suit, relief is for simple injunction and in the second suit, relief is for declaration and injunction has been sought. In order to avoid the contradictory judgments, both the said

suits i.e. Civil Suit No. 172 dated 6.7.2013 and Civil Suit No. 0036899/2013 are ordered to be consolidated and tried jointly by the learned trial Court.

Petition is accordingly disposed of.

Since the main petition is disposed of, the miscellaneous application pending, if any, also stands disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

24.4.2018
preeti

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No