

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

**RSA No.991 of 1992 (O&M)
Date of Decision.06.12.2018**

Food Corporation of India	Vs	Appellant
M/s Mangat Rai Subash Kumar		...Respondent

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. J.S. Toor, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate
for the respondent.

-.-

AMIT RAWAL J. (ORAL)

The present regular second appeal is against the concurrent finding of fact whereby the suit for recovery of ₹12,851.76 along with interest @18% has been decreed by the trial Court and affirmed by the lower Appellate Court.

Mr. Surinder Garg, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-plaintiff submitted that the decree has been complied long time back. Even as per provisions of Section 102 CPC, second appeal against the decree beyond ₹25,000/- is not maintainable. It would be far fetched to put the clock back.

In view of the aforementioned circumstances, concurrent finding of fact arrived at by the courts below cannot be faulted with, much less, no substantial question of law arises for determination by this Court. No ground for interference is made out. The second appeal is dismissed.

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

December 06, 2018
Pankaj*

Whether Reasoned/Speaking	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No