

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

115

1. **CR-7285-2018(O&M)**
Date of decision: 25.07.2022

TARSEM SINGH

..Petitioner

Versus

RAJINDER SINGH

..Respondent

2. **CR-7307-2018(O&M)**

TARSEM SINGH

..Petitioner

Versus

RAJINDER SINGH

..Respondent

3. **CR-6874-2019(O&M)**

TARSEM SINGH

..Petitioner

Versus

KARAMPAL SINGH

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Alok Mittal, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. L.S. Sidhu, Advocate
 for respondent.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

These three revision petitions arise from three identical orders passed by the Executing Court which are pending between the same parties.

There are various judgments and decrees passed by the Court for recovery of the amount against the petitioner. In execution petitions, the petitioner (judgment debtor) took a stand that the amount of decree has already been paid to the decree holder. In order to prove the payment he produced a receipt dated 05.04.2015. The Executing Court has permitted the parties to prove the said receipt, particularly when the decree holder denies the receipt of the amount. The Executing Court after appreciating the evidence has

found that the defence set up by the petitioner is neither plausible nor

proved. The Court has also held that once a decree has been passed and the judgment debtor was expected to pay the amount through Court and not outside of the Court.

The petitioner has also failed to prove that the receipt was signed by the respondent (decree holder).

In view thereof, no ground to interfere is made out.

Dismissed.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

July 25th, 2022
Ay

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes/No</i>