

CRR-186 of 2016

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

CRR-186 of 2016

Date of Decision: 25.03.2019

Pishora Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present:- Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate, for the petitioner.

RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)

Through instant revision, petitioner-complainant has laid challenge to judgment of the trial Court dated 16.10.2015, dismissing his complaint under Sections 447, 427, 506, 148, 149 IPC.

In nutshell, petitioner filed complaint against respondents No.2 to 21 (in short 'private respondents') on the allegations that despite *status quo* order dated 01.02.2011 passed by Commissioner Revenue, Jalandhar, in appeal filed by him, on 19.11.2013 private respondents in connivance with each other along with 20/25 unknown persons armed with deadly weapons entered into the suit property. They raising *lalkara* in utter violation of the *status quo* order, gave beatings to the petitioner, his son and grandson.

Trial Court, after recording preliminary evidence, without summoning the respondents, dismissed the complaint, vide impugned judgment dated 16.10.2015.

Learned counsel for the applicant *inter alia* contends that the trial Court failed to appreciate that on the alleged date of incident there was

CRR-186 of 2016

private respondents did not have any legal right to trespass joint holding in utter violation of the said order.

Having given thoughtful consideration to the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court finds the instant revision completely devoid of any merit for the reasons to follow.

No question of law much less substantial has been raised in this revision.

This Court while exercising its revisional powers has very limited jurisdiction, which can only be exercised, (i) when the Courts below have acted beyond jurisdiction vested in them or (ii) have not exercised the same diligently and (iii) have exercised illegally.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to show any such infirmities in the judgment of the trial Court.

Learned counsel, on asking of the Court, has fairly accepted that petitioner has lost his battle throughout on civil as well as revenue side. Resultantly, respondents have been declared co-sharers in the disputed land.

Above factual aspect of the case shows that petitioner with dishonest and *mala fide* intention filed the impugned complaint against the respondents and present revision to illegally enjoy the possession of joint holding and reap its fruit detrimental to the private respondents, who are lawful co-sharers in the disputed land.

Dismissed.

March 25, 2019
R.S.

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No