

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

C.R. No.1734 of 2015

Date of Decision.11.03.2015

Bijender Singh and anotherPetitioners

Versus

Harke son of Shri ViruRespondent

Present: Mr. Sudhir Hooda, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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?

-.-

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. The civil revision is untenable. The person who has suffered ex parte decree was brought home to the knowledge of such decree in execution proceedings. He has, therefore, now challenged the ex parte decree before this Court. The appropriate remedy for a person who is aggrieved by ex parte decree is to file an application to set aside the ex parte decree under Order 9 Rule 13. If he had been served with summons in suit, he shall file an application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act setting out the reasons for the delay in filing an application under Order 9 Rule 13. If such applications are filed, they will be taken up and disposed of by the Court on merits.

2. With these observations, the revision petition is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

March 11, 2015
Pankaj*