

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

CR No.6197 of 2015  
Date of decision : 26.02.2016

Mahavir Parshad

...Petitioner

Versus

Ran Singh

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL.**

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment ?
2. To be referred to reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present: Mr. Sumit Sangwan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. R.S. Sangwan, Advocate for the respondent.

\*\*\*\*

**AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)**

This Court while issuing notice of motion passed the following order:-

*“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that without deciding the objections and proceedings of the attachment, the trial Court passed the impugned order dated 01.08.2015 by summoning the petitioner-objector through non-bailable warrants.*

*Notice of motion for 11.01.2016.*

*In the meantime, the impugned order dated 01.08.2015 shall remain stayed. However, the interim order passed by this Court shall not prevent the trial Court in deciding the objections, stated to be pending, on*

*merits.”*

Mr. Sangwan, Advocate submits that after passing of the order dated 01.08.2015 and as well as order dated 06.04.2015, the parties have compromised and in lieu of compromise, Judgment Debtor had agreed to pay sum of Rs.3,10,000/- and did not honour the compromise but only paid a sum of Rs.7,000/- in cash and the execution application is being adjourned for honouring the compromise. Thus, there is no equity in favour of the petitioner for seeking indulgence of this Court.

It would be apt to reproduce the order dated 07.09.2015, which reads thus:-

*“Present:- Decree Holder in person with Sh. Sita Ran, Adv.  
Judgment Debtor in person with Sh. Fateh Singh, Adv.*

*The matter has been compromised between the parties in Rs.3,10,000/-. Today DH has received Rs.7,000/- in cash from the judgment debtor and remaining amount is payable at Lok Adalat on 19.09.2015. Now to come up on 19.09.2015 for payment.*

*Sd/- Natasha Sharma,  
ACJ(SD), Dadri, 07.09.2015.”*

In view of such situation, no further order is required as the parties have compromised.

Keeping in view the aforementioned facts, no ground is made out for interference.

Revision petition is dismissed.

**26.02.2016**

*pawan*

**(AMIT RAWAL)  
JUDGE**