

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

**C.R. No.1817 of 2016
Date of Decision.10.03.2016**

Chamkaur SinghPetitioner

Vs.

Lachhman Dass and anotherRespondents

Present: Mr. Vikas Singh, 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. Security offered must be in the appropriate form which is provided under Order 38 Rule 5 CPC and not under Order 41 Rule 5 CPC.

There can be no objection to the order passed by the Court below allowing for property security to be given to the value of ₹3 lacs. If it had already received a surety bond which was in the nature of personal bond, the Court was competent to pass an appropriate order by modifying the same.

2. I find no cause for interference and dismiss the revision petition but with the above observations.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

March 10, 2016
Pankaj*