

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

**C.R. No.1709 of 2015
Date of Decision.11.03.2015**

Subhash Chander son of Avinash ChanderPetitioner

Versus

Beant Singh and othersRespondents

Present: Mr. Varinder Kumar Shukla, 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. The revision petition is untenable. I must observe that if the petitioner as a plaintiff has any grievance that the suit should not have been dismissed for default or he had any justification for his non appearance on the day when it was dismissed, his remedy will be to file an application for restoration of suit under Order 9 Rule 9 and if that application is not filed within 30 days from the date of dismissal, he ought to set out the reasons in an application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act for not filing such application under Order 9 Rule 9. The petitioner will exhaust such remedy before approaching this Court.

2. The revision petition is dismissed but with the above observations.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

March 11, 2015
Pankaj*