Sanjiv Kumar Sharma
2018.04.06 17:32
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 2290 of 2018 (O/M)
Date of decision : 6.4.2018

Karamjit Kaur ..... Petitioner

Versus

Amardeep Singh ..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Ms. Monika Thakur, Advocate, for petitioner.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

-.- -.-

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Heard.

Impugned in present revision is order dated 23.2.2018, passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Taluka Court Payal, vide which one third salary of petitioenr-JD has been attached in the money decree.

The learned counsel for petitioner states that ex parte decree was passed against petitioner. She has also moved an application for setting aside the ex parte decree.

I am of the view that so long the decree stands, it has to be executed. No stay has been granted in an application filed under Order IX Rule 13 CPC, 1908. Therefore, there is no illegality or infirmity in impugned order. Consequently, revision is dismissed. Since main case has been dismissed, therefore, pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

6.4.2018
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes / No
Whether Reportable : Yes / No