

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

C.R.No.7289 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: November 02, 2015

Mohan Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Gurjeet Kaur & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL, JUDGE

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.A.S.Bhatti, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

The challenge in the present revision petition is to the impugned order dated 10.9.2015 (Annexure P-4), whereby the objections filed by the respondent/judgment-debtors in the execution proceedings have been allowed, whereas the execution application has been dismissed.

Mr.A.S.Bhatti, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the legal representative of the decree-holder and sought the execution of the decree. The Court ought not to have allowed the objections in the manner and mode it has been done.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and appraised the paper book.

It is a matter of record that the judgment and decree was passed on 11.3.1976, whereas, as noticed above, the execution application was filed on 9.7.2014. *Ex-facie*, the application is time barred and rightly so, the objections filed at the instance of the judgment-debtors have been allowed.

The impugned order cannot be said to have been passed illegally, much less, perversely.

I do not intend to differ with the findings rendered by the trial Court. The same are based on the legal proposition.

The revision petition is devoid of merit. The same is accordingly dismissed.

November 02, 2015
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE