



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

142

CR-8436-2025

Date of Decision: 18.11.2025

State of Haryana and others

.....Petitioners

Vs.

Kanta Thukral

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Harish Nain, AAG, Haryana

SUDEEPTI SHARMA J. (Oral)

1. The present civil revision petition is filed for setting aside of order dated 19.08.2025, whereby, opportunity to file objections was struck off; order dated 19.09.2025, whereby, application filed by the petitioner for staying of execution proceedings was dismissed; order dated 08.10.2025, whereby, application for setting aside of order dated 19.08.2025 whereby, defense of petitioner was struck off, was dismissed; order dated 11.11.2025, whereby, property of the petitioner was attached. Further prayer is for staying proceedings before executing Court.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the default on the part of petitioner for non-filing of objections was neither deliberate nor intentional, therefore, on last effective opportunity be granted to the petitioner subject to payment of cost to file their objections.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the whole record with his able assistance.

4. A perusal of the zimni orders shows that since the day of filing of the execution petition, petitioners are requesting for adjournment which shows their conduct.



5. A perusal of file shows that the reasoning given in the file for non-filing of objections in Para-8 of the present petition is totally vague and apparently seems not to be actual reasoning, since in Para-8, the movement of file within the department is pleaded to be the reason for not filing the objections.

6. Further, challenge in the present petition is to order dated 08.10.2025, whereby, the application filed by the petitioner for setting aside order dated 19.08.2025, whereby, the opportunity to file objections in the execution petition was struck off. A perusal of the order dated 08.10.2025 shows that the same is well-reasoned and there is no infirmity in the same.

7. Further, challenge is to order dated 19.09.2025, whereby, the application for staying the execution petition filed by the petitioner was dismissed. A bare reading of order dated 19.09.2025 shows that the same is detailed and speaking order and requires no interference by this Court.

8. Further, challenge is to order dated 11.11.2025, whereby, property of petitioner was attached. A bare reading of order dated 11.11.2025 shows that the same also has been decided in a rightful manner, therefore, requires no interference by this Court.

9. In view of the above and without commenting on the merits of the present case, the present civil revision is dismissed.

18.11.2025

Saahil

**(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No