

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

**CR No.7486 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : May 11, 2018**

Bhuley (since deceased) through LRs Petitioner

Versus

Net Ram (now deceased) through LRs and others Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Aditya Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Lokesh Sinhal, 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)

CM-3756-CII-2017

Application is allowed as prayed for.

Judgment and decree dated 04.11.2011 and objections are taken on record as Annexures R-1 and R-2 respectively.

Main Case

Petitioners have impugned the observations made by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Faridabad, in the order dated 19.08.2016, in which it was observed that the petitioner should have filed application to be impleaded as legal heirs of their father Bhuley.

Heard.

It comes out that an ex parte judgment and decree was passed. In the execution, some of the J.Ds. filed the objections, which were dismissed, vide order dated 19.08.2016. One of the objections was that in the main case, the legal heirs of Bhuley were not brought on record. The

present petitioners have not even filed the objections nor they have taken the legal steps regarding the ex parte judgment and decree. Therefore, merely against the observations passed by the Executing Court on the objections filed by other persons, the present revision petition does not lie and is dismissed, accordingly.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

May 11, 2018

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No