

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Revision No.7041 of 2015(O&M)

Date of decision: 19.10.2015

Satyawan

.....Petitioner

versus

Reena and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Kuldip Singh

Present: Mr.Surinder Gandhi, Advocate for the petitioner

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

Kuldip Singh, J. (Oral)

Impugned in the present revision is the order dated 16.9.2015, passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Rohtak, vide which the objections filed by the Judgment Debtor were dismissed.

Suffice to notice that an award was passed on 5.6.2007 under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 against the objector-petitioner herein. The claim in the objections of the JD are that the execution is time barred and that the previous execution was dismissed for want of prosecution on 15.10.2010. Therefore, fresh execution could not be filed.

I am of the view that there is nothing to show that the execution has become time barred. If execution is dismissed in

default, the option with the decree holder was to get the execution revived or file a fresh one for execution of the said award. The objections appear to have been filed just to delay the execution of the award.

No case is made out to interfere in the impugned order.

Consequently, the revision stands dismissed.

19.10.2015

gk

**(Kuldip Singh)
Judge**