

226

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 3224 of 2012 (O/M)
Date of decision : 7.3.2018

Union of India and another Petitioners

Versus

Pal Singh through LRs and another Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Deepak Malhotra, Advocate, for petitioners.

None for respondents.

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 present revision is order dated 7.3.2012 (Annexure-P-1), passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Bathinda, vide which it was held that there is no infirmity in the calculations mark A. Therefore, Union of India has been directed to pay Rs. 1,04,495/- to the decreeholders alongwith interest at the rate of 15 per cent per annum till the date of making payment.

The learned counsel for Union of India has argued that calculations are incorrect. It is further conceded that said amount has already been paid.

I am of the view that when the calculations were submitted, it was for present petitioners to point out any discrepancy in those calculations by submitting their own calculations.

However, the petitioners state that they have paid the amount as per their own calculations.

CR No. 3224 of 2012 (O/M)

If the petitioners feel that excess amount has been ordered, they can file objections to the calculations submitted by DHs and let the lower Court take a view whether objections raised by JDs are correct or not. No ground to interfere in the impugned order is made out. Consequently, revision is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

7.3.2018
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes / No

Whether Reportable : Yes / No