

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

**C.R. No.1324 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision.23.02.2016**

M/s Jasbir Singh Inderjeet Singh through its sole proprietor Amritpal Singh
.....Petitioner

Vs.

Harpinder Singh and others
.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Gurjeet Singh Kaura, 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. The petitioner's grievance is that an attachment had been ordered without even calling him upon to furnish security in the manner it is mandated under Order 38 Ruel 5 CPC. The defendant is at liberty to apply to the same Court which passed the order of attachment to accept security, test the same for its adequacy for the suit claim and if found adequate accept the security in accordance with law by following the due procedure and vacate the order of attachment which is already passed. The petitioner will have the liberty to have recourse before the trial court itself in the manner indicated above.

2. Notice to the respondents is dispensed with and the revision petition is disposed of with the above observations.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

February 23, 2016
Pankaj*