

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

CR No.8454 of 2015

Date of Decision: December 11, 2015

Gurpreet Kaur @ Rani and another

.... Petitioners

vs.

Gurjit Singh and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Amardeep Singh Gill, Advocate for the petitioners.

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 petition is the order dated 16.11.2015 (Annexure P-10 passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Samana, vide which the plaintiffs-petitioners were ordered to pay the court fee amounting to ₹2,53,07,825/-.

Vide order dated 08.08.2014 passed by this Court in CR No.422 of 2010, the plaintiffs were directed to pay the court fee under Section 7(v)(c) of the Court Fee Act, 1870

According to the plaintiffs, the net profit of their share in the year 2008-09 comes to ₹1,72,705.57P for Village Duggal Kalan and for Village Rampur Duggal, it comes to ₹15,14,482.75P. Accordingly, the court fee is payable on the total sum of ₹16,87,188.32P, which comes to ₹42,311/-.

The lower court found that under the said Section, the valuation of the suit is 15 times of such net profit. Therefore, the net profit was calculated to the tune of ₹2,53,07,825/- only and the court fee was, accordingly, ordered to be paid.

There is no dispute that the court fee is to be calculated @ 15 times of the net profit. Thus, there is no illegality in the calculation assessed by the lower court.

Hence, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

December 11, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE