

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

ESA No. 31 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 28.05.2015.

Ravi Dutt

...Petitioner

Versus

Surinder Kumar Sood and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI

Present: Mr. K.K. Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

M.M. Bedi, J.

Objections filed by the petitioner under Order 21 Rule 97 CPC have been dismissed vide impugned order dated 03.07.2014 and 11.03.2015.

Counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner along with other co-sharers is owner in possession of the property including the suit land and that the respondent-judgment debtor Raj Kumar could not sell the property more than his share.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

A perusal of the impugned order shows, the additional objections filed on behalf of the petitioner have been dismissed. After dismissal of his earlier objections, the additional objections deserve to be dismissed solely on the ground that fresh objections, which could have earlier been taken up, having not been taken, cannot be permitted to be raised.

In view of the above, I do not find any merit in the present appeal and the same is dismissed without prejudice to the other rights of the petitioner regarding alleged right, title or interest in the property.

Dismissed.

May 28, 2015.
kanchan

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE