

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

CR No. 6033 of 2013 (O&M)
Date of decision: May 19, 2015

Sant Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

Gurdeep Singh

...Respondent

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. Inderjit Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurbir Singh Sidhu, Advocate,
for the respondent.

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

1. The counsel for the petitioner states that his party could not come since he has suffered an injury in an accident. The counsel for the respondent concedes that the direction given already by this court on 27.3.2015 requiring the petitioner to furnish details of the property which he had offered as security has not been complied with.

2. I do not think it is necessary to hold up the trial of the case, but I will allow for the modification of the order that is already passed directing the defendant that instead furnishing bank guarantee to the tune of ₹3,50,000/-, the defendant will furnish immovable security to the value of ₹3,50,000/- and the petitioner will furnish the details of the property which is valuable enough to stand security for the amount already determined

within four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order. The court will issue notice to the respondent/plaintiff to elicit his response about the value of the property and accept or reject the security or give further direction in the manner that the situation might warrant.

3. The impugned order is modified and the revision petition is ordered on the above terms.

May 19, 2015
prem

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE