

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 7958 of 2015(O&M)
Date of decision : January 29, 2016

Prem Chand

..... Petitioner

Versus

Narinder (since deceased) through L.Rs

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Parminder Singh, 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 of the impugned order dated 3.9.2015 whereby while entertaining third party objections issues have been framed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the finding rendered by the trial court that parties are claiming possession on the basis of decree is totally alien to the judgment and decree. Third party has nothing to do with the execution of the judgment and decree passed in favour of the petitioner-decree holder, thus, the impugned order is not sustainable in the eyes of law.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and appraised the paper book.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that a third party filed objections and issues have been framed as per provisions of

Order 21 Rule 101 CPC. Since the petitioner has already obtained decree in his favour, I am of the view that the objections stated to have been filed should be decided as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of ten months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order giving three-three effective opportunities to the parties.

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

January 29 , 2016
archana