

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CM-2037-CII-2018 in/and
CR No. 8561 of 2017 (O/M)
Date of decision : 8.2.2018

Kala Devi through LRs

..... Petitioner

Versus

Shishu Pal and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Abhinav Singh, Advocate, for,
Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate, for applicant-petitioner.

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)

CM-2037-CII-2018

Document (Annexure-P-5) is taken on record.

Application is disposed of.

Main case

Heard.

It comes out that an application for execution of award, passed under The Land Acquisition Act, 1894, is pending before the learned Additional District Judge, Karnal. There, report of Patwari was submitted on behalf of present petitioner. However, opposite party claims that Patwari has made wrong report and wants to produce copies of mutations and jamabandis which were not considered by said Patwari, while preparing the report. This is to show the correct share of the parties. The lower appellate Court has taken the view that documents are essential for just decision of the case.

CR No. 8561 of 2017 (O/M)

-2-

I am of the view that since the trial Court feels that perusal of revenue record is just and necessary to determine the shares of the parties and consequent apportionment of land compensation, therefore, there is no ground to interfere in the impugned order. Therefore, instant revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

8.2.2018
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes / No

Whether Reportable : Yes / No