

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 3207 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : May 6, 2016

Satbir Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

The Oriental Insurance Co.Ltd.

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Manjeet Singh Khillan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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?

Amit Rawal, J (oral).

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the court had called upon the petitioner-decree holder to give list of properties and for warrant of attachment of properties on the ground that MACT has given right to the Insurance Company to recover the amount.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that objections were required to be treated as arguments. The same was not recorded by the court below, consequently, warrants of attachment should not have been issued.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and appraised the paper book and of the view that the impugned order Annexure P-2 issuing warrant of attachment for want of arguments in the objections is not sustainable for the reason that opportunity

should be given to the petitioner to address his case. However, objections are required to be treated as arguments or to make oral submissions.

In view of the aforementioned facts, one opportunity is granted to the petitioner to make such statement or address arguments, failing which the impugned order shall automatically become enforceable.

The revision petition stands disposed of.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

May 6 , 2016
archana