

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Date of Decision: April 03, 2019

1. CR No.6208 of 2018 (O&M)

Gurdaspur Improvement Trust

...Petitioner

Versus

Hardial Singh (since deceased) through L.Rs & others

...Respondents

2. CR No.623 of 2019 (O&M)

Gurdaspur Improvement Trust

...Petitioner

Versus

Fauja Singh (since deceased) through L.Rs & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. Rajeshwar Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner in both the cases.

Mr. Inderjit Sharma, Advocate,
for respondent No.1(i) and 2 (in CR No.6208 of 2018)

Mr. D.S.Sukarchakia, DAG, Punjab,
for the State.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

This order of mine shall dispose of two Civil Revisions bearing
No.6208 of 2018 and 623 of 2019 as the common question of fact and law
is involved.

Learned counsel for the petitioner expressed his inability to
comply with the undertaking given in the order dated 29.01.2019.

Mr. Inderjit Sharma, learned counsel for respondents No. 1(i)

and 2 has pointed out that as per the contents of the order dated 27.09.2018, sale/auction of the land measuring 21 kanals of the petitioner, which was ordered to be auction, was on a misrepresentation as they are attempting to ward off the liability, but no steps have been taken.

The respondents are executing the decree by seeking auction of the land as the petitioner has not been able to make the payment of the enhanced compensation resulting into auction of the land and, therefore, as a necessary corollary, the proceedings under Order 21 Rule 66 CPC would follow.

For the reasons aforementioned, I do not find any illegality or infirmity in the order under challenge. No ground for interference is made out. Resultantly, revision petitions are dismissed.

April 03, 2019
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No