

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

C.R. No. 8079 of 2016

Date of Decision: February 09, 2017.

Prem Nath

....Petitioner

Versus

Tilak Raj and others.

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Mr.Sandeep Jain, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Rajan Gupta, J (Oral)

Present revision is directed against the order passed by the executing court whereby it has held that decree passed by the court way back in the year 1999 stands satisfied.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has assailed the order. According to him, suit for specific performance was decreed on 1.10.99. Alternative relief was granted to compensate the decree holder with Rs.14,000/-. The decree holder thereafter filed execution petition which remained pending for a considerable period. When the case came up before the said court on 4.7.2016, judgment debtor produced the receipt of Rs.14,000/- and submitted that amount has been paid in terms of decree. The court thus disposed of the execution petition. I find no merit in the plea that order is unsustainable. Admittedly, decree passed by the court attained finality way back in the year 1999. There was no time limit fixed in the same for doing the needful. Decree being silent on this issue, the judgment debtor deposited the amount of Rs.14,000/- as required by the decree. No interference at this stage under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is called for. Dismissed.

**(Rajan Gupta)
Judge**

February 09, 2017.

BB

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No