

132

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

**Civil Revision No.5636 of 2018
Date of Decision: 28.08.2018**

AMRITPAL SINGH & ORS

.....Petitioners

Vs

BIKAR SINGH S/O GURDIAL SINGH

....Respondent

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr. Mr. S.S. Sodhi, Advocate for
Mr. Rishu Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

This revision petition has been preferred against the orders dated 30.08.2016 passed by the Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.) Barnala and the order dated 05.12.2017 passed by the Addl. District Judge, Barnala whereby the objections filed by the petitioners were dismissed.

Brief facts of the case are that the petitioners are the successors-in-interests of the judgment-debtors. Earlier objections filed by the judgment-debtors were dismissed. Now the petitioners have come forward by way of filing objections. As per demarcation report, there is a public street in Khasra

No.1274 and the same was encroached upon by the judgment-debtors and their successors. It was mentioned in the report that there are houses on both sides of street and the Panchayat has constructed drains on both sides. The objections filed by Chhota Singh were dismissed on earlier occasion.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the property has some slight variation.

I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners.

In view of apparent facts on record, there is no scope for interference in the present revision petition, the same is accordingly dismissed. In case some different cause of action is found accrued in favour of the petitioners, then they can always avail their legal remedy in accordance with law.

August 28, 2018

Atik

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No