

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

**CR- 4118-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 23.01.2018**

Naresh Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

Charanjit and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Kartik 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 9.5.2016 (Annexure P-7) vide which the third party objections filed by the petitioner under Section 21 Rule 58 CPC were dismissed by learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Hoshiarpur.

It comes out that for ₹ 1.40 lac along with interest @ 9% per annum from the date of execution of the agreement in relation was passed against the decree holder and against the judgment-debtor (respondent No. 2 in the present petition. Petitioner is the son of judgment-debtor. It is stated on behalf of the petitioner that he is ready to pay the decretal amount. It is reflected in the order dated 21.8.2017 that ₹ 1.00 lac has been deposited with the Executing Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further states that he will pay ₹ 1.00 lac within a period of two weeks from today to the decree holder and the balance amount within one month thereafter shall be paid.

It being so, present petition is disposed of with the direction that if judgment-debtor or the present petitioner pay the said amount as undertaken before this Court and satisfies the decree, then no auction of the house will be carried out otherwise the Executing Court can proceed with the auction of the house.

Disposed of with above direction.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

23.01.2018

preeti

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes
No