

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

**RSA No.873 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision.03.05.2019**

Satender Singh		...Appellant
	Vs	
Madan Lal and others		..Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. Vishwajeet Singh, Advocate
for the appellant.

-.-

AMIT RAWAL J. (ORAL)

The short point involved in the present appeal is whether the plaintiff can obtain decree of injunction seeking restraint against the defendants from interfering into peaceful possession and forcible dispossession in the absence of possession, the answer is 'NO'.

Concededly, in evidence plaintiff admitted that he is not in possession nor the defendants, despite the fact that the defendants claimed right on the basis of some sale deed. The injunction can be claimed by a person, even if he is not the owner, on the ground of long and settled possession; but not at the drop of the hat.

In view of such circumstances, I do not find any illegality and perversity in the concurrent finding of fact rendered by the Courts below, much less, no substantial question of law arises for determination by this Court. No ground for interference is made out. Resultantly, the second appeal is dismissed.

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

May 03, 2019
Pankaj*

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes

Whether reportable No