

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 3914 of 2016
Date of decision : June 1 , 2016

Jagbir Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Mandeep Kaur

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. J. S. Cooner, 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).

The petitioner-judgment debtor is aggrieved of the impugned orders Annexure P-1 and P-2. Vide Annexure P-1 objections have been dismissed as having been proceeded ex-parte whereas it should have been dismissed for default. The application for setting aside of the order dated 15.2.2016 has also been dismissed vide Annexure P-2 dated 4.5.2016.

It is conceded position on record that the petitioner-defendant is objector and judgment and decree regarding specific performance of the agreement to sell has attained finality upto this Court. No separate appeal has been filed. It is only an attempt to delay the execution. The executing court cannot go behind the decree. All the objections taken in the objection petition are basically repetition of defence

taken in the written statement which has been negated upto this Court.

No ground for even setting aside the impugned orders under challenge was made as it is a complete abuse of process of law as the judgment debtor is instrumental in not executing the judgment and decree.

I do not find any illegality and perversity in the impugned orders and the same cannot be said to have been passed without jurisdiction.

The revision petition is devoid of merits. Accordingly the same is dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

June 1 , 2016
archana