

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR No.6220 of 2017

Date of Decision: 14.09.2017

Ramal and others

.....Petitioners

Vs.

Dhanpati and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present:- Mr.J.S.Saneta, Advocate, for the petitioners.

RITU BAHRI, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner has come up in revision against the order dated 17.08.2017 whereby, the application made by the decree holder for depositing ad-valorem court fee has been allowed.

A perusal of the order shows that the suit of the plaintiff has been decreed on 26.02.2013 subject to payment of ad-valorem court fee within one month. Application for depositing the ad-valorem court fee has been filed on 25.03.2012 and report in this regard was received on 06.04.2013 and the Presiding Officer had directed the plaintiff to submit the court fee of Rs.5600/- and there was no delay found on the part of the plaintiff. The Court has been satisfied that the delay in placing on record the court fee had occurred due to the procedure adopted by the Court and no malafide delay was found on the part of the plaintiff. Since, the court fee has been deposited and initially application had been made within a period of one month, there was no role attributed to the plaintiff for depositing the ad-valorem court fee, the application had been rightly awarded.

So in the light of the discussion, the orders of the Courts below

do not reflect any material irregularity or perversity which warrant interference. Hence the present revision stands dismissed.

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

14.09.2017
anil

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No