

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

**CR-4167-2005 (O&M)
Date of decision : 8.3.2018**

Union of India

..... Petitioner

Versus

Mal Singh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- None for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajan Bansal, Advocate for the 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)

The case was passed over twice on the request of proxy counsel for the petitioner. On third call, no representation has been made on his behalf.

I have heard learned counsel for the respondents and perused the case file.

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 30.3.2005, (Annexure P-1) passed by learned Additional District Judge, Faridkot, vide which while dismissing the objections filed by the judgment-debtor/petitioner, it was held that the calculations filed by the decree-holder are correct and calculations filed by judgment-debtor are incorrect.

It comes out that an award was passed against Union of India which is being executed. Judgment-debtor/petitioner has claimed that they have paid the entire amount.

Both the parties filed the calculations. Learned Additional District Judge, Faridkot, after going through the calculations, found that decree-holder has given the correct calculations and have calculated the costs and interest as required under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. However, the calculations by judgment-debtor were found to be incorrect. There is nothing to contradict the said view.

In view of above, I do not find any merit in the present revision petition and the same is accordingly dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

8.3.2018
preeti

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No