

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR 2533-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 24.04.2018

Randeep Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

Karam Singh and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Kuldip Singh

Present: None for the petitioner
Mr.Akshay Jindal, Advocate for the caveators-respondents

- 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)

None has appeared on behalf of the petitioner despite second call. Therefore, I have considered the case of the petitioner.

Petitioner has impugned the order dated 22.3.2018 (Annexure P4), vide which, learned Additional District Judge, Karnal, while adjourning the appeal, refused to stay the operation of the impugned judgment and decree on the ground that it is monetary loss and cannot be called irreparable loss.

It comes out that the suit of the plaintiff-petitioner was decreed for specific performance directing him to deposit the balance sale consideration, holding that he has failed to prove the payment of Rs.18 lakhs as earnest money which is also now required to be deposited.

I am of the view that the suit of the plaintiff-petitioner has been decreed. He has filed an appeal against the adverse findings to the effect

that he had also not paid another sum of Rs.18 lakhs as earnest money. Plaintiff himself is seeking stay of judgment and decree, which is in his favour. Therefore, there is no ground to stay operation of the impugned judgment and decree.

Resultantly, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

24.04.2018

gk

(Kuldip Singh)
Judge

Whether speaking/ reasoned:

Yes

Whether Reportable:

No