

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

RSA No.2726 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of Decision: September 30, 2015

Varinder Kumar

.... Appellant

vs.

Harjit Singh

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Sunny K. Singla, 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)

Impugned in the present regular second appeal is the judgment and decree dated 13.01.2014 passed by learned District Judge, Sangrur, affirming the judgment and decree dated 01.06.2009 passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Malerkotla, vide which the suit of the plaintiff-respondent for specific performance of the agreement dated 15.07.2006, was decreed.

I have heard learned counsel for the appellant and have also carefully gone through the case file.

In the written statement, defendant had claimed that he had obtained loan of ₹20,000/- from the plaintiff. He alleged that the agreement as forged and fictitious document. The plaintiff examined himself and the attesting witness to prove the agreement. Findings of the facts were recorded that the agreement is proved. Therefore, the specific performance was ordered.