

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

CR No. 3929 of 2013 (O&M)
Date of decision: August 4, 2015

Jasbir Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

Raghbir Singh 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. Sandeep Arora, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate,
for respondents No. 2 and 7.

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

1. The suit is with reference to recovery of immovable property in the hands of the defendant/petitioner, which is claimed by the respondents/plaintiffs as having been brought about through a fraudulent sale by the 1st defendant. The 2nd defendant is a subsequent purchaser and the petitioner who is 3rd defendant claims to be a purchaser from the 2nd defendant. The petition for setting aside the decree was filed about 7 years after the decree was passed. The court was unconvinced about the contention that she had not received the summons and that no *munadi* was effected at the place of her residence.

2. I will allow the petitioner to enter contest on the condition that she deposits Rs. 20,000/- to be paid to the plaintiffs as cost for allowing the

proceedings to carry on for more than a decade and the amount shall be paid within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

If the amount is not paid, the order passed already shall stand confirmed.

3. The impugned order is set aside and the revision is allowed on the above terms.

August 4, 2015
prem

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE