

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

CR No.1366 of 2014  
Date of Decision : 12.10.2015

Kuldeep Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Baljinder Singh and others

.... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN**

Present: Ms. Amandeep Kaur, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. K.R. Dhawan, Advocate  
for respondents No.1 and 2.

\*\*\*\*\*

**K. KANNAN, J.**

On the previous date of hearing, I observed that the case was being adjourned from time to time at the request of the counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner. On 23.03.2015, I had taken note of the fact that the petitioner was a pendent lite purchaser and hence the petition would be barred under Order 21 Rule 102 CPC. I had called upon the counsel to argue on the merits of the petition in March 2015. On 23.04.2015, a similar request was made and I directed the adjournment be made by making a note that it will not be entertained in future and imposed cost of ₹ 10,000/-. On a subsequent date, the cost was paid but still a request for

adjournment was made and plea of adjournment was accepted and the case was brought for hearing on 30.06.2015. Again, a plea for adjournment was made and it observed that no further adjournment will be granted. When the case was called on 24.08.2015, counsel reported that there was a mistake in uploading of the order referred to the date of hearing and therefore, I set down a fresh date on 19.09.2015. Even on that date, an adjournment was sought. It is under such an expression, the case was brought for hearing to a fresh date. Today also, a request for adjournment was made through the proxy counsel. The petitioner cannot maintain the petition for adjudication in terms of Order 21 Rule 102 CPC. The order already passed dismissing the petition brought by subsequent purchaser is sustained.

Civil Revision is dismissed.

**( K. KANNAN )**  
**JUDGE**

12.10.2015  
'yogesh'