

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 2471 of 2015 (O/M)
Date of decision : 25.8.2015

Sat Parkash

..... Revisionist

Versus

Baljeet

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Saurabh Dalal, Advocate, for the revisionist.

Mr. Rajesh K. Kataria, Advocate, for respondent.

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

-:-

-:-

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Impugned in the present revision is the order dated 10.9.2014 (Annexure-P-3), passed by the learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Nuh, vide which the application of the plaintiff for restoration of the suit, was dismissed.

The perusal of the impugned order dated 20.3.2014 (Annexure-P-2) shows that when the case was fixed for evidence of the plaintiff, the same was dismissed on account of non-appearance of the plaintiff. Therefore, the dismissal is under Order 9 Rule 8 of Code of Civil Procedure, 1908. The present revisionist could always

CR No. 2471 of 2015 (O/M)

-

file an application under Order 9 Rule 9 CPC for restoration of the suit.

In these circumstances, the revisionist is relegated to the lower Court to avail remedy under Order 9 Rule 9 CPC.

The present revision is accordingly disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

25.8.2015
sjks