

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 6967 of 2015(O&M)
Date of decision : March 10, 2016

Madan Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

Kurshaid

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Kumar Bokolia, 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-decree holder is aggrieved against the impugned order whereby objections filed by the judgment debtor by taking aid of Section 60(CCC) CPC has been allowed and execution application has been consigned to record room.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that in pursuance to the order, he has placed on record the site plan that it was not an open plot but a constructed house. He further submits that the decree is for a sum of ₹2,04,000/- along with interest.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and appraised the paper book and of the view that the judgment debtor is entitled to take benefit of the provisions of Section 60(CCC) CPC as

the property sought to be attached in pursuance to the execution proceedings is consisting of four rooms, kitchen, store, a varandha and open space, rightly so the trial court has allowed the objections, but this would not preclude the decree holder from seeking attachment of the movable assets of the respondent-judgment debtor.

I do not find any illegality and perversity in the impugned order 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

March 10 , 2016
archana