

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

C.R. No.1547 of 2016

Date of Decision.29.02.2016

Malkiat Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Vs.

Subhash Chander and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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 petitioners will have an appropriate remedy for an appeal against the order passed by the court since the order passed by the Executing Court is on an application filed by third party making a claim in relation to the very same property. The petitioners' contention that the sale made during the pendency of proceedings under Order 21 Rule 102 CPC may afford a ground for preferring an appeal but will not be a ground for entertaining a revision petition.

2. If there is any delay in preferring the appeal, the Court may consider for excluding the same if the application is filed under Section 14 of the Limitation Act for the bona fide prosecution of the case before another forum.

3. The revision petition is disposed of with the liberty as aforesaid.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

February 29, 2016

Pankaj*