

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

**C.R. No.3703 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision.28.05.2015**

M/s Gayatri Sales

.....Petitioner

Versus

M/s M.Tech Informatics Ltd. and another

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, 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 petition filed is a needless apprehension on the alleged advice by the Judge that the petitioner has to approach the Appellate Court. There need not be such advice by the trial Court nor need the petitioner take it seriously. If there is an order staying the encashment of bank guarantee on 19.05.2015, there is nothing for the petitioner to be aggrieved to complain and come by means of revision petition. If his apprehension is that the bank guarantee is likely to be encashed, he may move an appropriate application before the trial Court and seek for vacating any possible stay against encashment of bank guarantee as and when such a prospect arises through a separate application. Either way, there is no reason for the petitioner to approach this Court.

2. The revision petition is dismissed with above observations.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

May 28, 2015
Pankaj*