

261
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR-5298-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : 30.01.2018

Amarjeet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Joginder Singh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Ms. Preeti Aggarwal, Advocate for
Mr. Gaurav Mohunta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Randeep Singh, Advocate 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)

Learned counsel for respondent has put in appearance and filed his vakalatnama in Court today. The same is taken on record.

Present revision petition has been filed for directing the trial Court to decide the application dated 2.11.2015 (Annexure P-2) filed under Order 9 Rule 13 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, by defendants-respondents which is pending for about more than 2 years.

Heard.

It comes out that suit for specific performance was filed by the plaintiff-petitioner and was decreed ex-parte vide judgment and decree dated 14.7.2014 (Annexure P-1). Now defendants-respondents had filed an application for setting aside the aforesaid ex-parte judgment and decree. During the pendency of the said application, the judgment and decree cannot be executed.

In view of the matter, present revision petition is disposed of with a direction to the trial Court to expeditiously decide the said application filed under Order 9 Rule 13 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 by the defendants-respondents preferably within a period of six months.

With aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

30.01.2018
preeti

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No