

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 7900 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of decision: 28.07.2015

SUNIL GUPTA

... Petitioner

VS.

HARKUNWARDEEP SINGH AND OTHERS

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. B.B.Sobti, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil Khunger, Advocate for respondent No.1.

K.Kannan, J.

The order passed by the Appellate Court while granting stay is vague and purport. The Appellate Court is bound to say what shall be the nature of the security, shall has to be tendered before the Executing Court.

Considering that it is a suit for specific performance of an agreement alleged to be for Rs. 4,52,000/-, I direct the petitioner-defendant to furnish property security to the tune of Rs. 4,52,000/- and also pay the suit cost that includes the Court fee and counsel fee to be paid to the decree-holder, within four weeks from the date of the receipt of the copy of the order. The property security that the petitioner will furnish will be examined by the Court for its adequacy with the amount stipulated above.

The order passed already stands modified and the civil

revision is disposed of with the above directions. If there is a failure to comply with the directions on either payment of cost or furnishing of security within the period of four weeks, the stay granted shall stand vacated.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

28.07.2015
kv