IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Revision No.2800 of 2014
Date of decision: 18.03.2015

Anil Kumar Hans and others ... Petitioners

versus

M/s Ge Money Financial Services Pvt. Ltd.
.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. R.K Dhiman, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Nakul Sharma, Advocate,
for the respondent.

K.Kannan, J. *(Oral)*

There is no scope for intervention at the execution stage when the creditor that has a charge on the property for the loan advanced is seeking for sale of the property after notice under Order 21 Rule 66 CPC. The Court has allowed a reprieve to the petitioners at the time when it issued notice in April, 2014 by staying the further process in execution by directing a deposit of ₹1 lakh. The benefit of securing the time by about 11 months must be taken as good enough a time for the petitioners to have made appropriate arrangements. If they still feel suffocated by the loan, discharge of loan by legal process could be the only answer. The revision petition is dismissed. The amount deposited before the court will be appropriated by the decree holder towards the debt.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

18.03.2015
sanjeev