



127

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

CR-5660-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 16.10.2025

Nishan Public School

...Petitioner

Versus

Mrs. Manoj Saini and others

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN

Present: Mr. Sandeep Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate for respondent No.1.

HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN, J. (Oral)

1. The legality of the order dated 13.08.2025 has been challenged in the present Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, whereby the objection petition filed on behalf of the petitioner-Judgment Debtor (JD) was dismissed and warrants of attachment were ordered to be issued for attaching the account of JD.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner-objector filed objection petition alleging that the respondent/decreed-holder is not entitled to the back-wages for the period during which she remained absent and the Education Tribunal subsequently ordered in the Award dated 25.03.2019 that the period of absence of the respondent/decreed-holder be treated as leave of the kind due. However, the petitioner could not furnish any calculation sheet reflecting the amount to be deducted on account of the said period. A limited prayer has been made that the petitioner may be permitted to furnish such a calculation sheet before the Executing Court so that the

exact entitlement of the decree-holder can be quantified.



3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondent has pointed out that as per the order dated 06.01.2025 (Annexure P-5) passed by the Education Tribunal, a sum of Rs.5,67,671/- was quantified as due towards the decree-holder, however, the petitioner-JD has represented before the Executing Court that only a sum of Rs.3,71,074/- is due and out of which a cheque of Rs.2,00,000/- was handed over to the decree-holder at that time. However, it is not disputed that a detailed calculation sheet was not furnished by the JD.

4. Both the counsel are in agreement that decree-holder has received the aforesaid payment of Rs.2,00,000/-, subject to surety.

5. I have considered the aforesaid submissions and perused the paper-book.

6. It transpires that though the petitioner-JD has filed the objections taking a plea that decree-holder is not entitled to receive the back wages in terms of the order passed by the Education Tribunal, however, no detailed calculation sheet was furnished before the Executing Court. The petitioner being the management of the school is having records to calculate and quantify the dues in terms of the Award passed by the Education Tribunal, as such, in the interest of justice, it is required that such calculation sheets be furnished by both the parties before the Executing Court to assist the Court to arrive at a proper conclusion regarding the quantification of the amount due against the petitioner-JD.

7. Consequently, present petition is disposed of with a direction to the Executing Court to determine the quantum of the amount to be paid by the petitioner-JD and for such purpose, both the



parties shall furnish detailed calculation sheets before the Executing Court within a period of 01 month from today.

8. However, there are no observations on merits regarding the quantum of the amount due towards the decree-holder.

9. Since the calculation sheet was not furnished by the petitioner-JD in the first instance before the Executing Court, the petitioner is burdened with costs of Rs.20,000/- to be paid to the respondent/decreree-holder. Such payment shall be made at the time of furnishing the calculation sheet before the Executing Court. In case the costs are not paid, present petition shall be deemed to have been dismissed.

10. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

16.10.2025
atulsethi

[HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN]
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No