

222.

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

Civil Revision No.4292 of 2013

Date of decision: 19.11.2015

Ved Singh Katariya

... Petitioner

versus

Surender

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr.Prashant Vashisth, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. N.S. Panwar, Advocate,
for the respondent.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

1. The objection by the defendant through an application filed under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC was on the issue of adequacy of court fee and the valuation adopted by the plaintiff. The objection was that the plaintiff had given the valuation as mentioned in the sale deed which had come about 10 years prior to suit. The valuation adopted by the plaintiff was as recited in the sale deed as ₹ 90,000/-, while the defendant would contend that the property was worth ₹3 lakhs and more.

2. The court shall appoint bailiff to collect details of valuation of the property from the village official and the valuation as notified in the Registrar' office at the relevant date of filing of the

suit and give its report. The court shall examine the report and assess the valuation and call upon the plaintiff to pay the deficit court fee, if any, after determining the correct valuation.

3. The order already passed is set aside and the revision petition is allowed on the above terms. The entire exercise of determination of valuation shall be carried out within a period of 3 months and the direction for payment of additional court fee, if any, has to be carried through in the manner provided under Order 7 Rule 11(c) CPC.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

19.11.2015
sanjeev