

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

Civil Revision No.548 of 2015

Date of Decision: February 27, 2019

Amar Pal

...Petitioner

Versus

Kishan Singh & another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. Ashok Kaushik, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Rana, Advocate for
Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

This Court, on 26.02.2015, passed the following order:-

“CM No.4278-CII of 2015

Application for placing on record copy of the plaint and sale deed, is allowed. Said documents are taken on record, subject to just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

CR No.548 of 2015

Contents that the case of the petitioner was that he was owner of land measuring 43 sq.yards, bearing plot No.219 which was part of khewat No.184, khatoni No.319 rectangle No.49 killa No.1 (8-0) by virtue of sale deed dated 06.01.2009 and the petitioner had purchased the same vide agreement dated 23.08.2013 from respondent No.2-Mahender.

The defence of respondent No.1 was that he was in physical possession of plot No.217 measuring 43 sq.yards, which was not situated in the same killa but situated in Killa No.2. He had further claimed that he had purchased the plot

from Raj Kumar on 21.10.2011 vide an agreement. The petitioner had further specifically averred that he is residing and using the plot in question and using the same with his family and was in possession and his possession was interfered on 30.06.2014 and a case under Sections 107/151 Cr.P.C. Was lodged which was admitted by the respondent No.1.

It is, accordingly, submitted that even the vendor of the petitioner, respondent No.2 had appeared in Court and submitted that he had handed over possession to the plaintiff-petitioner and therefore, in such circumstances, the Courts below were not justified in declining the relief of injunction.

Notice of motion for 18.08.2015.

In the meantime, parties shall maintain status quo regarding possession.”

The present revision is directed against the orders of the courts below, whereby ad interim application filed along with the suit for permanent injunction in the year 2014, has been dismissed.

Without commenting on the merits and de-merits of the case, I dispose of the present revision by issuing direction to the trial Court to decide the suit as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of six months.

In the meantime, the order dated 26.02.2015 shall continue.

February 27, 2019
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No