

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

136

CR-5373-2017

Date of Decision:16.08.2017

Rupa Ram

.....Petitioner

Versus

Jaswant Singh

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK.

Present: Mr.Priyanshu Kamra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J.(Oral)

Feeling aggrieved against the order dated 17.04.2017 passed by the learned executing court, directing the revenue authorities to incorporate the name of decree-holder in the relevant revenue record, regarding land measuring 17 kanals 7 marlas and granting symbolic possession of the said land to the decree-holder, judgment-debtor has approached this Court by way of instant revision petition, filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, for setting aside the impugned order.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

A bare perusal of the impugned order passed by the learned executing court would make it crystal clear that no prejudice of any kind, whatsoever, has been caused to the petitioner by passing the impugned order. It is so said because the decree-holder was definitely entitled to get the suit land measuring 17 kanals 7 marlas incorporated in his name in the relevant revenue record. It was also rightly directed by the learned

executing court that symbolic possession of the suit land be given to the decree-holder.

After issuing the abovesaid directions, learned executing court, on the statement suffered by learned counsel for the decree-holder, permitted the execution-petition to be dismissed as withdrawn, being partly satisfied. Having said that, this Court feels no hesitation to conclude that the learned executing court was well within its jurisdiction to pass the impugned order and the same deserves to be upheld.

During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner could not point out any patent illegality or perversity in the impugned order passed by the learned executing court, which may warrant interference at the hands of this Court, while exercising its revisional jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

No other argument was raised.

Considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case noted above, coupled with the reasons aforementioned, this Court is of the considered view that the present revision petition is misconceived, bereft of merit and without any substance, thus, it must fail. No case for interference has been made out.

Resultantly, with the above-said observations made, instant revision petition stands dismissed, however, with no order as to costs.

August 16, 2017
seema

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No