

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

R.S.A. No.5027 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 06.09.2023

Megh Raj

.....Appellant

Versus

Lakhwinder Singh and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present:- Mr. Baljeet Singh Kathuria, Advocate
for the appellant.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.(Oral)

1. The correctness of concurrent findings of fact arrived at by the Courts below is challenged by the plaintiff in the second appeal. He filed a suit for grant of decree of permanent injunction restraining the respondents from interfering in his possession. He claims that the ground floor of the suit property is being used for running a shop whereas the first and second floors are being used for residential purposes. The defendants have contested the suit while asserting that the plaintiff is not in possession of the aforesaid property and the family owns as many as six shops. The plaintiff is already in possession of another shop and he is not in possession of two shops.

2. Thus, both the Courts below have dismissed plaintiff's suit by observing that the suit property is not clearly identified, hence no relief can be granted to the plaintiff.

3. Learned counsel representing the appellant though made an attempt, however, he failed to draw the attention of this Court to any substantive error in reading or misreading of the evidence.
4. Hence, no ground to interfere is made out.
5. Appeal stands dismissed.
6. Application(s), if any also stands disposed of.

September 06, 2023
poonam

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>No</i>