115

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

(Thorough Video Conferencing)

Civil Revision No.1021 of 2021

Date of Decision: 30.04.2021

SHAMSHER SINGH AND OTHERS

.....Petitioners

<u>V/s.</u>

BALJIT SINGH

.....Respondent

HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL. CORAM:

Present: Mr. R.K. Shukla, Advocate,

for the petitioners.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

The instant petition is filed by the petitioners for setting aside

the order dated 22.03.2021 (Annexure P-7) passed by the Civil Judge (Junior

Division) Samana vide which application filed by the petitioners-plaintiffs

for appointment of the Local Commissioner was dismissed.

The petitioners-plaintiffs have filed a suit for permanent

injunction to restrain the defendant from interfering in the peaceful

possession of the suit property annexed with the plaint and the site plan

(Annexure P-1 and P-2 repectively). The case of the petitioners is that the site

plan produced before the Court below by the defendant and attached with the

sale deed in his favour with respect to the suit property is non-existent. Still

further, the respective site plans which have been produced by the parties

before the Court below are different from each other, hence, the appointment

of a Local Commissioner is necessitated to visit the site plan and report about

the correct factual position of the property with respect to the correctness of

site plans so produced by the both the parties.

SANDAL SHARMA 2021.04.30 16:05 I attest to the accuracy and integrity of this document

Civil Revision No.1021 of 2021

Page 2 of 2

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners, perused the

impugned order and material on record.

The impugned order(s) comes across as a very well reasoned

one and does not suffer from any illegality much less perversity which would

warrant interference of this Court. It need not be over emphasized that it is a

settled law that in a suit for permanent injunction, the matter pertaining to the

possession of the suit property would have to be decided by the Court on the

basis of evidence, oral or documentary, which would be led by the parties

and not through a Local Commissioner as it would amount to gathering of

evidence. In the case in hand, disputed questions of fact are involved, which

can only be adjudicated upon by the Court once the issues are framed and

:

evidence led by the parties.

In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances, the

instant petition stands dismissed.

April 30, 2021

[MANJARI NEHRU KAUL]
JUDGE

Ess Kay

Whether speaking / reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No