

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR 245-2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 27.03.2018

Vijay Kumar Sharma @ Vikrant Kumar and others

.....Petitioners

versus

Raj Rani and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Kuldip Singh

Present: Mr.Navkesh Singh Goraya, Advocate for the petitioners
Ms.Jagdeep Bains, Advocate for respondent nos.1, 3 & 4

1. *Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

Kuldip Singh, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioners after arguing for sometime, states that they had not mentioned in the application as to who is in possession of the original sale deed and whether the address of the said person is available with them or not. Learned Civil Judge (Junior Division) Ludhiana has dismissed the application only on the ground that the applicant has failed to show as to in whose possession the original sale deeds were. Seeks liberty of the Court to file fresh application after complying with the provisions of Sections 65 and 66 of the Indian Evidence Act 1872.

In view of the matter, the present revision petition is dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to file a fresh application with correct particulars after complying with the provisions of Sections 65 and 66 of the

Indian Evidence Act 1872. Since, Execution Application is of the year 1999, the Executing Court is directed to conduct day-to-day proceedings and dispose of the Execution Application.

Since the main case has been dismissed, therefore, the pending CM, if any, also stands disposed of.

27.03.2018

gk

**(Kuldip Singh)
Judge**

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes

Whether Reportable: No