

Company: Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.

Website: www.courtkutchehry.com

Printed For:

Date: 18/10/2025

Smt. Gajna Vs Manoj Kumar and Another

Civil Revision No. 804 of 2011

Court: High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Date of Decision: March 27, 2012

Acts Referred:

Civil Procedure Code, 1908 (CPC) â€" Order 7 Rule 11, 151#Constitution of India, 1950 â€"

Article 227

Hon'ble Judges: L.N. Mittal, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: B.K Bagri, for the Appellant; Sumeet Sangwan, for the Respondent

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

L.N. Mittal, J.

Plaintiff Smt. Gajna feeling aggrieved by order dated 9.9.2010, Annexure P/4 passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior

Division), Rewari has filed this revision petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to challenge the said order. Plaintiff - petitioner has

filed suit challenging release deed dated 28.8.2006 allegedly executed by her on the ground of fraud etc. Defendants moved application Annexure

P/2 under Order 7 Rule 11 read with section 151 of CPC (in short, CPC) for direction to the petitioner - plaintiff to pay ad valorem court fee on

the value of the suit property. Plaintiff by filing reply Annexure P/3 opposed the said application. Learned trial court vide impugned order Annexure

P/4 directed the plaintiff to pay ad valorem court fee. Feeling aggrieved, plaintiff has filed this revision petition.

- 2. I have heard Learned Counsel for the parties and perused the case file.
- 3. Counsel for the petitioner contended that since the release deed has been challenged on the ground of fraud, the plaintiff petitioner is not liable

to pay ad valorem court fee. The contention cannot be accepted. Plaintiff - petitioner is party to the release deed in question having allegedly

executed the same. Consequently, the plaintiff - petitioner is liable to pay ad valorem court fee. In this view, I am supported by judgment of

Hon"ble Supreme Court in the case of Suhrid Singh @ Sardool Singh Vs. Randhir Singh and Others, . Consequently, the plaintiff - petitioner has

been rightly directed by the trial court to pay ad valorem court fee. There is no infirmity much less illegality, perversity or jurisdictional error in

impugned order of the trial court so as to call for interference by this Court in exercise of supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the

Constitution of India.

4. However, before concluding, it has to be noticed that defendants-respondents in their application Annexure P/2 alleged the value of the suit

property to be Rs 50 lacs, but plaintiff - petitioner in her reply Annexure P/3 controverted the said plea of the defendants. Consequently, the trial

court shall determine the market value of the suit property and ad valorem court fee shall be paid accordingly by the plaintiff - petitioner. Subject to

observation in the preceding paragraph, the instant revision petition is dismissed being meritless.