

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

RSA No.2812 of 1988 (O&M)

Date of Decision: April 11, 2019

The State of Punjab & another

...Appellants

Versus

Tej Ram

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. Rukhsaar Dhindsa, AAG, Punjab,
for the appellants.

Ms. Ramaneeq Kaur, Advocate,
for the respondent.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

The question involved in the present Regular Second Appeal whether the State of Punjab could be permitted to recover the royalty in terms of money from the brick-kiln owners resulting into filing of the suit for injunction seeking restraint from recovering ₹ 24,954-80P, which was decreed by the trial Court and affirmed in appeal, has already been adjudicated by this Court and as well as by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **State of Punjab and others Versus M/s. Ved Parkash and Co., 2011 (5) R.C.R. (Civil) 655 and State of Punjab Versus M/s. Vishkarma and Co., 1993 (2) R.R.R. 38.** In such circumstances, I am of the view that no Substantial Question of Law arises for determination by this Court in differing with the concurrent findings of fact and law. Resultantly, the appeal is dismissed.

April 11, 2019
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No