

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

C.R. No.1015 of 2013

Date of Decision.17.05.2016

Balwinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Tek Singh and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. A.K. Sama, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Bharat Julka, Advocate for
Mr. C.M. Munjal, Advocate
for the respondents.

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. The plaintiff who was not party to the transaction and who was challenging the alienation in favour of defendants' predecessor was directed to pay ad valorem court fee on the market valuation. The decision is erroneous, for the plaintiff has himself admittedly not a party to the transaction nor was the plaintiff seeking for possession of property. There is no requirement for ad valorem court fee.

2. The order already passed is set aside. The suit shall proceed on the basis of valuation already adopted by the plaintiff. The revision petition is allowed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

May 17, 2016
Pankaj*