

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

CR No.2458 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of decision : April 19, 2018

Ramesh Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

Radha Krishan

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Rose Gupta, Advocate for the 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)

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 12.11.2014 (Annexure P-3) passed by learned Addl. District Judge, Hisar, affirming the order dated 15.05.2012 (Annexure P-3) passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Hisar, vide which an application filed by the petitioner under Order IX, Rule 13 CPC, 1908 for setting aside the ex parte order dated 19.10.2004 and ex parte judgment and decree dated 03.11.2006 was dismissed.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have also carefully gone through the case file.

It was claimed that the signatures of the plaintiff might have been obtained by the defendant on the summons when he was under the influence of liquor. The petitioner also claimed that he has no knowledge of the suit. No proclamation munadi was effected in the abovenoted case. He also claimed that he was lodged in Central Jail, Hisar. His story has been disbelieved by both the Courts below, which took the view that he was duly served. There are concurrent findings recorded by two Courts below. There is no ground to interfere in the same.

As such, the present revision petition is dismissed.

The petitioner is always at liberty to take appropriate plea before the Executing Court, praying for settlement of dispute through mediation, if he so desires.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

April 19, 2018
sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No