

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

238

C.R.No.2975 of 2014

Date of Decision:21.07.2015

Des Raj

.....Petitioner

Versus

**M/s Mangal Chand Bharat
Bhushan Commission Agents
and another**

.....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? Yes**

**Present: Mr.P.S.Jammu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.**

**Mr.Vikas Kumar, Advocate,
for the respondents.**

K.KANNAN, J.(oral)

The revision petition raises a fundamental issue at law that uncertified payment cannot be brought as a defence by the judgment debtor. The contention of the judgment debtor before this Court is that the Court has rejected the petition filed for recovery of money without even framing any issue. Nothing is required to be framed for a patent and an abject absurd defence brought by the judgment debtor and the defence deserves rejection in *limine*, the way it was dealt by the Court I find no cause for interference.

The revision petition is dismissed.

**July 21, 2015
seema**

**(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE**