

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

C.R. No.4129 of 2015

Date of Decision.06.07.2015

Romesh Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

Mohan Lal and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Baldev Singh Sodhi, 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 against the order of summary dismissal against one of the defendants for not taking steps for service. The counsel says that the trial has not commenced and he was under the impression that unserved defendant-respondent No.1 who is his own brother would take notice of the proceedings and enter appearance and there was no wanton negligence on his part. Having regard to the limited scope of enquiry, I dispense with notice to the respondents and direct one more opportunity go be given to the plaintiff to take steps to summon the defendant. If such steps are taken within two weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order on payment of costs of ₹ 5,000/- to the District Legal Services Authority attached to the Court, the Court shall issue summons to the unserved defendant and fix a date for his appearance and proceed with the case in accordance with law. If the amount as directed is not paid within two weeks, the order passed will

prevail.

2. The impugned order is set aside on the above terms and the revision petition is allowed to the above extent.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

July 06, 2015
Pankaj*