

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

CR No.1729 of 2021

Date of Decision:-25.11.2021

Savita Gupta

...Petitioner

Versus

Kanika Goel and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. MADAAN

Present :- Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Khurana, Advocate
for respondents No.1 and 2.

Mr. Gaurav Goel, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

Mr. Akshay Jain, Advocate
for respondents No.4 and 5.

H.S. MADAAN J.(Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that since in the civil suit filed by the petitioner, on an application under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 CPC filed, the trial Court had granted ad-interim injunction to the petitioner-plaintiff, therefore, she has obtained the relief which she sought for in the present civil revision, the petitioner has instructed him to withdraw the instant civil revision petition.

Learned counsel for respondents No.1 and 2 has however

submitted that the petitioner had pleaded a wrong fact in the instant petition that she has filed a petition under Section 372 of the Indian Succession Act in Court at Patiala (Annexure P-3), which as per the information sought by his associate counsel, the same has not been filed till 4th of October 2021, in that way an attempt was made to mislead this Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has controverted this assertion.

Accordingly, in view of the statement made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the present revision petition is dismissed as withdrawn. Respondents No.1 and 2 may avail of the remedy open to them with regard to the allegations against the petitioner.

November 25, 2021
Vijay Asija

(**H.S. MADAAN**)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes / No
Yes / No