

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

CR No. 159 of 2013 (O&M)
Date of decision: April 30, 2015

M/s Condor Power Products (P) Limited

...Petitioner

Versus

M/s Regency Steels and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

- 1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?**
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?**

Present: Mr. Lokesh Sinhal, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Shakun Chaudhary, Advocate, for
Mr. Ajay Ghangas, Advocate,
for respondent No. 1.

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

1. In an application for setting aside an ex-parte decree, the court passed an order staying the decree. However, in the execution application filed by the decree-holder, he secured an order of attachment of the judgment debtors' bank account. When he sought to vacate the order through an application, the court has imposed a condition that the entire decreed amount should be deposited as precedent condition for permission to operate the account. This court, while ordering notice in the revision filed against the order passed by the executing court, directed the judgment debtors to deposit Rs.15 lacs. It is reported that deposit has also been made. Justice is met by imposing a condition which is appropriate and the deposit will remain to the credit of the suit till the application for setting

aside the ex-parte is considered and disposed of. The manner of treatment of the deposit will be abide by the order that may be passed in the application for setting aside ex-parte order. The order passed already is set aside.

2. The revision petition is allowed with the above observations.

April 30, 2015
prem

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE