

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No.4376 of 2013 (O&M)

Date of decision: 4.12.2015.

M/s Pirthi Chand Kaushal

..... Petitioner

Versus

Kulwinder Singh and others

..... Respondents

2nd

CR No.4777 of 2013 (O&M)

Date of decision: 4.12.2015.

M/s Pirthi Chand Kaushal

..... Petitioner

Versus

Kulwinder Singh and others

..... Respondents

3rd

CR No.4778 of 2013

Date of decision: 4.12.2015.

M/s Pirthi Chand Kaushal

..... Petitioner

Versus

Kulwinder Singh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporters or not? Yes
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest?

Present : Mr. Vikas Bahl, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Narinder Kumar Vadehra, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Namit Gautam, Advocate for respondent No.1.

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

Concededly, a decree for recovery of ₹14,49,632/- was passed in favour of the petitioner-decree holder on 31.05.1990, and as no appeal was preferred against the said decree, the same has since attained finality. Vide these three Civil Revision Nos. 4376, 4777 and 4778 of 2013, petitioner has assailed three separate orders passed by the executing Court. Grievance of the petitioner is that despite having dismissed the objections preferred by contesting respondent, executing Court vide order dated 4.2.2013, reopened the matter without there being any application for review. As also the order dated 14.05.2013 (Annexure P-11), vide which a formal application moved by respondent No.1-objector for review of the order dated 4.2.2013, was accepted and the objections filed by him were set down for hearing on merits. And also the order dated 24.05.2013, vide which the executing Court had framed the issues arising for determination in the objection petition.

The matter is pending before this Court since July 2013, and there being no interim order staying the proceedings before the Executing Court, the parties to the lis have not only led their respective evidence but the matter has even been heard in part. That being so, learned counsel for the parties, having argued the matter at some length, have reached a consensus that let this petition be disposed of only with a direction to the executing Court to decide the matter within a specified time. Consequently, these petitions are disposed of with a direction to the executing Court to

decide the objections preferred by respondent No.1 on the date already fixed
i.e. 9.12.2015, if possible, but in any case, within a period of one month
thereafter.

December 4, 2015

Manoj Bhutani

**(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE**