

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

CRM-M-31297-2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 06.09.2018

Gurparsahd

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- None for the petitioner.

Mr. Sidakmeet Sandhu, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sandeep Jasuja, Advocate
for respondent No. 8.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for respondent No. 8 submits that inadvertently in the last order, his presence has been marked for the petitioner whereas he is representing respondent No. 8. He further submits that despite the fact that on 28.08.2017, the petitioner stated that he intends to clear the outstanding dues and in order to show his bonafide, he is ready to pay ₹1 Lakh every month towards the outstanding loan, he has not done the same. It is further submitted that in fact the vehicle in dispute was brought to respondent No. 7, a dealer of respondent No. 8, for repairs on 19.01.2017 and respondent No. 7 after carrying out required repairs raised an invoice of ₹33,368/-, however, the petitioner did not make the payment of said amount and the truck is lying with respondent No. 7 since then.

Reply filed by way of affidavit dated 12.10.2017 of Assistant Commissioner of Police, Central Jalandhar, on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 4, is also on the similar line.

Since the petitioner himself has failed to make payment to respondent No. 7 for repair works and has failed to obtain possession of the truck, no ground for issuing any direction to respondent Nos. 1 to 4 is made out.

Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

September 06, 2018

Waseem Ansari

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No