

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

RSA No.587 of 2013 (O&M)
Date of Decision.19.09.2015

Roop Singh

.....Appellant

Versus

Chetan Singh

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Namit Gautam, Advocate
for the appellant.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. Whether Reporters of local papers 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?

-. -

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. Delay of 521 days in filing the appeal is condoned.
2. The only plea made by the appellant is that the plaintiff had not registered as money lender and therefore, the enforcement of the claim for recovery of money on a promissory note was not competent. There is no particular requirement that a person who lends the money should have a licence unless he is a professional money lender and there is a requirement of registration as such. Any private accommodation to a person who is known or to class of persons whom the plaintiff used to give money when he was professionally engaged in some other duty will not require any such registration. Merely because he has lent money, it ought not to be taken that he was a professional money lender. The suit ought to be taken as one instituted under the Negotiable Instruments Act and if proof of the instrument was available, there was no scope for dismissal of the suit.

3. I find no substantial question of law for consideration in the second appeal. The second appeal is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

September 19, 2015
Pankaj*