

109

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

**C.R. No.3126 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 03.05.2016**

M/s Lakshmi Emporium and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

Ashok Kumar and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Mohan Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

This revision has been filed against the order dated 04.02.2016 passed by the Executing Court dismissing the objections filed by the petitioners.

The respondent No.1 had filed an eviction petition against the respondent No.2. During the pendency of the petition the petitioners filed an application under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC for being impleaded as respondents in the execution. The said application was allowed by the trial Court. However, the respondent No.1 challenged it by way of filing a revision petition bearing CR No.1394 of 2013. The said revision petition was allowed by this Court by order dated 19.08.2014 and this Court gave a

categoric finding that the petitioners were strangers to lis. That order was allowed to become final and ultimately the eviction petition was allowed. In the execution petition which was subsequently filed by the respondent No.1 the petitioners again filed the objections on the same ground on which they had sought impleadment. The said objections having been dismissed the petitioners are before this Court.

In my opinion, once the order in revision bearing CR-1394-2013 was allowed to become final the petitioners can not now again be heard to object to the execution on the very same ground.

Consequently, the revision petition is dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending Civil Misc. Application, if any, also stands disposed of.

May 03, 2016
ashish

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE