



206

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

CR-1290-2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 13.02.2025

Ram Gopal & Anr.

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

Rattan Chand

... Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Ashdeep Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Neeraj Yadav, Advocate for the petitioners.

None for the respondent.

ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)

1. The limited challenge in the present case is to the issuance of non-bailable warrants against petitioner No.1-judgment debtor. On 04.03.2024 the following order was passed :

“Learned counsel for the petitioners would contend that vide the impugned order dated 20.02.2024 non-bailable warrants of arrest have been issued against the petitioners. The learned counsel would further contend that the petitioners undertake to appear before the Court on the next date of hearing i.e. 05.03.2024, as also to furnish security qua the decretal amount.

Notice of motion returnable 25.07.2024.

On furnishing security for the decretal amount to the satisfaction of the Executing Court, operation of the impugned order dated 20.02.2024 shall remain stayed.”

2. On 28.03.2024 the following order was passed by the Executing

Court :

“Perusal of the file transpires that on 05.03.2024, JD appeared before the court. In the meanwhile, an order passed by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court at Chandigarh, through property channel, was received whereby impugned order dated 20.02.2024, whereby non bailable warrants of arrest were issued against JD was stayed on furnishing security for decretal amount. The JD Ramgopal had filed affidavit regarding security of decretal amount and he had also placed on record copy of transfer deed whereby, he become owner of the property. So, in view of the order so, non bailable warrants of arrest issued are hereby recalled but same thing not incorporated in zimni order dated 05.03.2023. Reader is directed to give a note that zimni has been corrected further is directed to upload the order again with a note that zimni has been correct vide order dated 28.03.2024.

Adjourned to 30.03.2024 for consideration.”

3. Today none has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent despite service. The learned counsel for the petitioners’ states that in view of the order dated 28.03.2024 passed by the Executing Court, the present revision petition has since been rendered infructuous.

4. Dismissed as having been rendered infructuous. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

13.02.2025
Yogesh Sharma

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO