

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

**C.R. No.1523 of 2015
Date of Decision.03.03.2015**

Jeet Kaur	Versus	Petitioner
Lalit Kumar		Respondent

Present: Mr. K.S. Dhillon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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 no scope to come before this Court for assailing an order where defence is struck off. The time limit prescribed under Order 8 Rule 1 CPC before when written statement is to be filed, the Supreme Court has found in *Salem Advocate Bar Association, Tamil Nadu Vs. Union of India 2005(3) RCR (Civil) 530* to be directory and not mandatory and any person who was unable to file an application for seeking for extension could invoke the very same Court's jurisdiction with an application seeking for extension of time and set out reasons as to why written statement could not be filed. If such an application is filed along with the written statement, the court would consider if there exists any circumstance for condonation of delay and for filing written statement beyond the period of 90 days and pass appropriate orders either receiving the written statement or rejecting the same.
2. With this liberty, the civil revision is disposed of.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

March 03, 2015

Pankaj*