

**HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA**  
**Bench: Justice Alka Sarin**  
**Date of Decision: 7th June 2024**

CIVIL REVISION NO. 3058 OF 2019 (O&M)

**SAKATTAR SINGH ...PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**MANJIT SINGH AND OTHERS ...RESPONDENTS**

**Legislation:**

Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (CPC) – Order 9 Rule 13  
Constitution of India – Article 227

**Subject:** Civil revision petition challenging the dismissal of an application to set aside an ex-parte judgment and decree on grounds of improper service of summons.

**Headnotes:**

Civil Procedure – Setting Aside Ex-Parte Decree – Improper Service of Summons – Petitioner filed an application under Order 9 Rule 13 CPC claiming he was never served properly, citing incorrect address in plaint – Trial court and appellate court dismissed application and appeal, respectively – High Court examined the records and found petitioner was duly served at the same address during execution proceedings – No explanation provided for delay in filing the application under Order 9 Rule 13 even after admitted date of knowledge [Paras 1-7].

Date of Knowledge – Delay and Limitation – High Court noted that even if the date of knowledge is accepted as 14.05.2012, application for setting aside ex-parte decree was filed after more than a year without any explanation or request for condonation of delay – Emphasized importance of timely action and proper procedural compliance [Paras 5-7].

Decision: Revision petition dismissed – Court found no merit in the petition due to lack of explanation for delay and proper service of summons during execution proceedings – No illegality or irregularity in the impugned orders [Paras 6-7].

**Referred Cases:**

- Kewal Krishan v. Suraj Bhan (1980) 1 SCC 416
- Parimal v. Veena (2011) 3 SCC 545
- G.P. Srivastava v. R.K. Raizada (2000) 3 SCC 54

Representing Advocates:

For Petitioner: Mr. B.S. Jaswal

For Respondent No. 1: Mr. A.S. Salar



ALKA SARIN, J.

1. The present civil revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India challenging the impugned order dated 15.02.2017 and order dated 11.03.2019 whereby the application filed by defendant No.1-petitioner under Order 9 Rule 13 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 has been dismissed.

2. The brief facts relevant to the present lis are that in 2002 the plaintiff-respondent No.1 herein filed a suit for possession by way of specific performance of an agreement to sell dated 11.11.1999 against the defendants i.e. petitioner and respondent No.2 – Shamsher Singh (since deceased) in respect of Khasra No.150 min measuring 125 sq. yds. situated in Village Kale Ghanupur Tehsil and District Amritsar on payment of Rs.30,000/- as also for permanent injunction. The suit was decreed ex-parte on 10.01.2007. In 2013 when the plaintiff-respondent No.1 had taken out execution proceedings, the defendant No.1-petitioner filed an application under Order 9 Rule 13 CPC for setting aside the ex-parte judgment and decree dated 10.01.2007. The case set-up by the defendant No.1-petitioner was that he never served and infact a wrong address was given in the plaint intentionally and the address of defendant No.1-petitioner was given as 5-A, Mohindra Colony, Model Town, Amritsar instead of 5-A, Majitha House, Rani Ka Bagh, Amritsar and consequently he was proceeded against ex parte and an ex parte judgment and decree was passed on 10.01.2007. It was further averred that it was only when the summons in the execution were received that he came to know of the ex parte judgement and decree dated 10.01.2007 and thereafter filed the present application. The said application was contested by plaintiff-respondent No.1 who

filed a reply thereto. Vide impugned order dated 15.02.2017 the application was dismissed by the Trial Court. Aggrieved by the same an appeal was preferred by the defendant No.1-petitioner which appeal was also dismissed by the Appellate Court vide impugned order dated 11.03.2019. Hence, the present revision petition. 3. Learned counsel for the defendant No.1-petitioner would contend that the defendant No.1-petitioner was never served at the correct address and that the address mentioned in the plaint was incorrect. It is further the contention of the learned counsel that both the Courts have not appreciated that the correct address of defendant No.1-petitioner was 5-A, Majitha House, Rani Ka Bagh, Amritsar, however, the address given in the plaint was 5-A, Mohindra Colony, Model Town, Amritsar.

4. Per contra the learned counsel for the plaintiff-respondent No.1 would contend that the defendant No.1-petitioner was duly served, however, he chose not to appear and an ex parte judgment and decree was passed on 10.01.2007. It is further the contention of the learned counsel that the defendant No.1-petitioner put in appearance before the Executing Court on 14.05.2012, however, the application for setting aside ex parte judgement and decree dated 10.01.2007 was filed on 17.05.2013 and there was no explanation forthcoming for the said delay.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. In the present case though the case set-up by defendant No.1-petitioner is that he was never served at the correct address, however, it is a matter of record that in the execution petition the very same address as given in the plaint was mentioned. Defendant No.1-petitioner was duly served and put in appearance in the

execution proceedings. The learned counsel for the defendant No.1-petitioner is not in a position to deny the fact that even before the Executing Court the defendant No.1-petitioner had put in appearance through his counsel on 14.05.2012. The date of knowledge would start, even if the case of the petitioner is accepted at its face-value, from 14.05.2012. The application under Order 9 Rule 13 CPC was filed on 17.05.2013 i.e. after more than a year. There is absolutely no explanation forthcoming for the said delay. On a query put by the Court to the learned counsel for the defendant No.1-petitioner as to the explanation for the delay in filing the application under Order 9 Rule 13 CPC even after the admitted date of knowledge i.e. 14.05.2012, the learned counsel has admitted that there is nothing on the record to explain the delay. Infact, the application under Order 9 Rule 13 CPC proceeds on the premise that it was being filed within time from the date of knowledge. There was no application or even a prayer for condonation of delay. Further still, both the Courts had noticed that though the defendant No.1-petitioner claimed that he was not served at the address, however, in the execution proceedings, on the same very address, the defendant No.1-petitioner received the summons and put in appearance through his counsel.

7. In view of the above and in view of the fact that even if the date of knowledge is considered to be 14.05.2012, there is no explanation given for the delay in filing the application under Order 9 Rule 13 CPC which was filed after a delay of more than one year nor was any application filed or even a prayer made for condonation of delay, I do not find any merit in the present revision petition. There is no

illegality or irregularity in the impugned orders. The revision petition is dismissed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

© All Rights Reserved @ LAWYER E NEWS

\*Disclaimer: Always compare with the original copy of judgment from the official website.