

259

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

CR No. 8444 of 2018
Date of Decision: 25.07.2019

Akhil Dev

-Petitioner

Vs

Veena Bhagat and others

-Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Varun Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sanjeev Roy, Advocate,
for respondent No.5.

Mr. S.P. Soi, Advocate,
for respondents No.8 and 9.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner states that respondents No. 8 and 9 are the only contesting respondents. Service qua other respondents be dispensed with.
2. Ordered accordingly.
3. Petitioner has preferred this revision petition against the order dated 06.10.2018 passed by Additional District Judge, Jalandhar vide which respondents No.8 and 9 were permitted to alienate the property with some rider.
4. The Additional District Judge, Jalandhar has

observed that in case respondents No.8 and 9 sell the property to anyone, then they would be liable to incorporate the recital of pending litigation in the document of transfer.

5. The aforesaid arrangement was made keeping in view the doctrine of *lis pendens*.

6. In view of impugned order, apprehension of the petitioner is duly met.

7. A suit for specific performance on the basis of agreement to sell was filed. Before filing of the aforesaid suit, defendants No.1 to 4 sold the property in favour of defendant No.5 and defendant No.5 further sold the same to defendants No.6 and 7. Defendants No.8 and 9 are the subsequent vendees from defendants No.6 and 7 and their sale deed was also prior to filing of suit.

8. The aforesaid defendants have been impleaded by the plaintiff in the suit, wherein prayer for stay of further alienation of the suit property was made.

9. Considering the rider placed by Additional District Judge, Jalandhar in the event of proposed sale deed by defendants-respondents No.8 and 9, grievance of the petitioner is fully met.

10. No prejudice is going to be caused to the petitioner in view of observations made by lower Appellate Court.

11. No interference is called for in this revision petition.
12. Dismissed.

25.07.2019
Jyoti Yadav

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No