

120.

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

Civil Revision No.8378 of 2015

Date of decision: 10.12.2015

Parminder Singh and others

... Petitioners

versus

Baldev Krishan Singla and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mrs. Anju Arora, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ? No.
2. To be referred to the reporters or not ? No.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?No.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

1. Pending consideration of an appeal to be admitted beyond the period of limitation, the decree holder has taken steps for execution and has caused the attachment of the property of the judgment debtor. The gross prejudice stated is that the workshop is being run and if the property is put to sale, the means of livelihood will be lost.

2. If there is any order of stay at the appellate court, there cannot perhaps be an objection that execution shall not proceed. I will, therefore, make no intervention in the order. However, in the

interest of justice, I direct that the Executing Court will receive a portion of the amount claimed which the petitioners offer before this court as the party would be willing to deposit, namely, an amount of ₹ 50,000/- and keep the further process in execution in abeyance till the decision is taken by the appellate court. The petitioners are at liberty to make such an application before the Executing Court and the Executing Court will receive the deposit and consider the plea for staying its own proceedings till the appellate court decides the issue on the application filed for condoning the delay.

3. The revision petition is disposed of but with the liberty to approach the Executing Court for suitable direction in the manner referred to above.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

10.12.2015
sanjeev