

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

RSA No.4686 of 2013 (O&M)

Date of Decision: November 02, 2015

Chand Singh

.... Appellant

vs.

Kulwant Singh and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. H.S. Dhandi, Advocate for the appellant.

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)

The present regular second appeal has been filed against the judgment and decree dated 17.08.2013 passed by learned Addl. District Judge, Patiala, affirming the judgment and decree dated 07.04.2011 passed by learned Addl. Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.), Rajpura, whereby the suit of the plaintiff was decreed for alternative relief/ recovery of ₹2,00,000/- along with interest @ 9% per annum from the date of execution of the agreement to sell till decree and interest @ 6% per annum from the date of decree till its realization. The legal heirs of defendant No.1 were directed to make the payment to the plaintiff.

Along with the present appeal filed in the year 2013, an application was filed for grant of six months time to affix the court fee.

Since then, the case is being adjourned for one or another date. Now two years have elapsed, but deficiency of the court fee has not been made good. In the application, the prayer was made for grant of six months time to affix the court fee.

Therefore, I do not find any ground to grant further adjournment for making up the deficiency of court fee. The application stands dismissed. Accordingly, the appeal also stands dismissed.

November 02, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE