

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Civil Revision No.4443 of 2017
Date of Decision: January 25, 2019

Karuna @ Lilawati

...Petitioner

Versus

Beero Devi & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. R.A.Sheoran, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Sangwan, Advocate,
for respondent Nos.1 & 2.

Mr. A.K.Goel, Advocate,
for respondent Nos.3 & 4.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

Both the parties are not in dispute that the suit for injunction had already been filed along with an application under Order 39 Rule 1 & 2 CPC, which has been dismissed.

Learned counsel for the parties brought to the notice of the Court, the order dated 11.07.2017 which reads as under:-

“Learned counsel, inter alia, contends that defendant Nos.4 and 5, who had entered into an agreement to sell with defendant No.1 have now resiled from the said agreement as per reply to the suit on the ground that daughter-in-law was having dispute with regard to the property and the said dispute can continue for number of years. Since the agreement to sell has not been executed, the application filed under Order 39 Rule 1 & 2 should not have been dismissed.

Notice of motion for 07.10.2017.

Meanwhile, status quo with regard to possession be

maintained”

Instead of pondering upon the merits and de-merits of the case,
I dispose of the present revision petition while passing the status-quo order
with a direction to the trial Court to dispose of the matter as expeditiously as
possible, preferably within a period of ten months from the date of receipt of
certified copy of the order.

January 25, 2019
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No