IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Revision No.8121 of 2015
Date of decision: 15.12.2015

Veena and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

Kulwinder Singh and others

.....Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. Sunny K. Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Ritu Bahri, J.

Challenge in this petition is to the order dated 04.07.2015 (Annexure P-3) passed by the Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Malerkotla, whereby application filed by defendant Nos. 2 and 3-petitioners under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC has been ordered to have become infructuous and the order dated 05.08.2015, dismissing another application under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC filed by the petitioners.

While dismissing the second application, the trial Court has framed an additional issue i.e. issue No.10, which is as follows:-

> "10. Whether the suit of plaintiff is not properly valued for the purpose of Court fee? OPD

Once, a specific issue with regard to value of the Court fee has been framed, no ground is made out to interfere in the impugned order. Moreover, in view of the judgments passed by this Court in ***Manjula Mittal alias Manju Rani Vs. Sohan Lal and others,*** 2014 (1) RCR (Civil) 83 and ***K.C. Gupta & another Vs. Rajat Gupta & others,*** 2015 (1) ICC 523, no

AJAY PRASHER
2015.12.22 10:32
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
High Court Chandigarh

revision filed by the defendant on the issue of Court fee, is otherwise, maintainable.

In view of the above, the impugned orders do not require any interference.

Dismissed.

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

15.12.2015
ajp

AJAY PRASHER
2015.12.22 10:32
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
High Court Chandigarh