

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No.4469 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision:05.08.2016

Baljit Singh and others

... Petitioners

Vs.

Murti Shri Vishnu Avtar Baba Ram Dev and another ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. H.P.S.Ghuman, Advocate
for the petitioners.

AMIT RAWAL J. (Oral)

The petitioner-defendants are aggrieved of the impugned order, whereby, an application filed by them for directing the respondent/plaintiffs for affixing proper Court fee, has been dismissed.

Mr. H.P.S.Ghuman, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-defendants submits that it is borne out that previously an application under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC was filed on similar ground and the same was dismissed, vide order dated 23.07.2015 on the ground that it was a temple. However, during the cross examination of the plaintiffs' witnesses, it has surfaced that plaintiffs have no proof of the ownership of the property in dispute.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner-defendants and appraised the paper book and of the view that suit is almost in midway. The Court fees can always be affixed, in case of objection has been taken in the

written statement, at the final stage.

With the aforementioned observations, no ground is made out for interference in the impugned order.

Accordingly, the revision petition stands dismissed.

August 05, 2016

savita

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No