

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

C.R. No.1151 of 2013

Date of Decision.27.03.2015

Smt. Raj Rani and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Subhash Chander and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Nitin Goyal, Advocate for
Mr. Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sandeep Punchhi, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

Mr. P.K. Ganga, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

-.-

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. There is a written plea for adjournment. I decline the plea. The application for rejection of plaint appears to have been filed after the commencement of the trial. The rejection provisions themselves ought to ensure that the suit is unnecessary taken for trial and if there is a prima facie bar by law or any of the circumstances that are laid down under Order 7 Rule 11 exists that case could be ordered to be rejected. An application moved after trial had commenced and after the witnesses of the plaintiff were also examined would not seem appropriate at all. I decline to make any intervention on merits sought to be canvassed in the application.

2. The civil revision is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

March 27, 2015
Pankaj*