

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

110

**RSA No.857 of 2016
Date of decision: 17.07.2018**

Manjit Singh

..... Appellant

Versus

Chanan Singh

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate, for
Mr. Atul Jain, Advocate for the appellant.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (ORAL)

Parties to this litigation are father and the son. The father has filed a suit for mandatory injunction claiming that he had permitted the son to reside in the premises as a licensee which has been revoked and therefore, son should vacate the premises and hand over the vacant possession. In the written statement, defendant-appellant took a stand that the property belongs to Shiv Singh, the brother of the plaintiff i.e. his uncle. Both the Courts on appreciation of evidence have found that the property is in fact owned by the plaintiff and son is in possession as a licensee. The plea taken by the defendant that the property is not owned by the plaintiff is not proved on the file. The sale deed Ex.P-2 dated 12.06.1964 has been produced to prove ownership.

In view thereof, there is no scope for interference with the concurrent finding of fact arrived at by the Courts below.

Appeal is dismissed.

**(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE**

17.07.2018
Dinesh Bansal

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes / No
Yes / No