



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Civil Revision No.3820 of 2024
Date of Decision: 11.07.2024

M/s Umang Printer & another
...Revisionists-Petitioners
Versus
M/s Pixel Graphics
...Respondent

CORAM: HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present:- Mr. Ashish Bansal, Advocate,
for the revisionists-petitioners.


* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)

Feeling aggrieved by the order (Annexure P-4) handed down by learned Civil Judge (Sr. Division), Chandigarh (for short ‘the Executing Court’) on 04.02.2020 in the *Execution Petition No.4649 of 2018* titled as ‘*M/s Pixel Graphics versus M/s Umang Printer & Anr*’, whereby the Objection Petition filed by the petitioners-Judgment Debtors (here-in-after to be referred as the ‘JDs’) has been dismissed and by the order (Annexure P-5) rendered by learned Additional District Judge, Chandigarh (for short ‘the Appellate Court’) on 19.01.2024 in *MCA No.28 of 2020*, dismissing the appeal, moved by the JDs against the order Annexure P-4, they (JDs) have preferred the instant revision-petition to lay challenge to the same.

2. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners-JDs in the present revision-petition, at the preliminary stage and have also perused the file carefully.

3. Learned counsel for the JDs contends that the respondent/ Decree Holder-Firm (here-in-after to be referred as the ‘DH’) has filed the above-said Execution Petition through one Jatinder Kumar while claiming



him to be its (DH's) Attorney whereas he had never been so authorized and was, thus, not competent to file and pursue the afore-referred Execution Petition but the trial Court has erroneously dismissed the Objection Petition filed by the JDs and the Appellate Court has also wrongly dismissed the above-said Appeal vide the respective impugned orders and therefore, these orders are not legally sustainable and are liable to be set-aside.

4. However, the afore-raised contention does not hold any water because a perusal of the copy of the judgment, i.e Annexure P-1, passed by the trial Court in the Civil Suit filed by the DH, reveals that this Suit had been filed by said Jatinder Kumar as the Power of Attorney holder of the DH and the JDs have not placed the copy of the written statement, as filed by them in the Suit, on the record so as to establish that they had raised the objection regarding the competence of the above-named Attorney to file and pursue the Suit. Moreover, as per Clause-3 in the copy of the Special Power of Attorney as submitted in the Court today, said Jatinder Kumar has been duly authorized to file the civil suit, reply, written-statements, application, Affidavits, evidence, complaint etc. on behalf of the DH and it being so, it does not lie in the mouth of the JDs to raise any objection about his competence to file and pursue the afore-mentioned Execution Petition on behalf of the DH.

5. As a sequel to the fore-going discussion, it follows that the impugned orders, as handed down by both the Courts below, do not suffer from any illegality, irregularity, infirmity or perversity so as to warrant any interference by this Court. Resultantly, the revision-petition in hand, being bereft of any merit, stands dismissed.

July 11, 2024
seema

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether Reportable: No