

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

C.R. No.1081 of 2016

Date of Decision.12.02.2016

Nawal Singh (since deceased) through his LRs	Petitioner
Vs.	
Dharam Singh @ Dharan Singh and others	Respondents

Present: Mr. Jagmohan S. Ghuman, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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. A third party objector who says that he has removed the encroachment that was already there, having been earlier caused by the judgment debtor. He also wanted the property to be demarcated. He offered no evidence and gave no application for the property to be demarcated. The Court has allowed for further process in execution and rejected the third party objection. I do not find any error for interference. The revision petition is dismissed.

2. The court bailiff shall ensure that at the time of delivery, the delivery is effected only with reference to the property for which the decree has been actually granted and the court may, if it so thinks essentially, secure appropriate assistance of village official to identify the property which has to be delivered and ensure that the decree is executed only for a property for which the decree has already been passed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

February 12, 2016