

120.

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

Civil Revision No.3587 of 2016

Date of decision:23.05.2016

Smt. Krishna Rani

... Petitioner

versus

Bhim Saini and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. C.M. Munjal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

1. A strange plea is brought before me is that a person, who is aggrieved about a judgment and wants to prefer an appeal, since he is not a party, he need not pay court fee. The contention is untenable and the revision petition is equally so. The court fee payable shall be same as for plaint as well as for appeal in the light of the Article 1 Schedule I of Court Fees Act, 1870.

2. The petitioner's contention is that he would have the benefit of refund of amount which has been paid to the defendant. He may seek for such relief through an independent suit or may be in the appeal which he wants to file challenging the decree for specific performance passed, if such a relief is tenable at all.

3. The revision petition is dismissed.

**(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE**

23.05.2016

sanjeev