

116

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

CR No.4834 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: August 03, 2015

Mohinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Nirmal Singh

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. Mohd. Salim, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SABINA, J

Petitioner has filed this petition challenging the order dated 29.05.2015.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner had not executed pronote and receipt in question. In fact, respondent was habitual of forging pronotes and receipts and criminal cases were pending against him.

In the present case, respondent has filed suit for recovery against the petitioner on the basis of pronote and receipt dated 20.05.2010. During the pendency of the suit, respondent moved an application for attachment of the immovable property of the petitioner. Vide the impugned order, the said application was allowed. Hence, the present petition.

The learned trial Court while allowing the application has noticed that during the pendency of the suit, petitioner had sold some of his property. Learned trial Court has noticed that as per Jamabandi placed on record, petitioner had sold property mentioned in Part b vide sale deed dated 15.10.2014. In these circumstances, the learned trial Court rightly allowed the application moved by the respondent and ordered the attachment of the property of the petitioner mentioned in Part a and c of Jamabandi for the year 2011-2012.

No ground for interference by this Court, is made out.

Dismissed.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

August 03, 2015

mahavir