

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

Civil Revision No.3011 of 2014

Date of Decision: September 02, 2015

Rishi Raj Yadav

.... Petitioner

vs.

Smt. Chanderkala and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Sanjay Vij, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sudhir Aggarwal, Advocate for respondent No.1.

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 04.04.2014 (Annexure P-1) passed by learned Addl. Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.), Sohna, vide which the application of the petitioner-defendant No.2 under Order VII, Rule 11 CPC was disposed of.

It comes out that the case was fixed for arguments. The present petitioner filed an application under Order VII, Rule 11 CPC for rejection of the plaint on the ground that proper court fee has not been affixed.

A perusal of the file shows that in this regard, issue No.6 has been framed. Both the parties have also led their evidence. Therefore, at this stage, there is no ground to interfere in the impugned order. However, the lower court is advised that issue No.6

regarding the valuation of the suit for the purpose of court fee and jurisdiction be decided first so that the deficiency of the court fee, if found, can be recovered before the final disposal of the suit.

The present revision petition is, accordingly, dismissed with the abovesaid observations.

September 02, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE