

**Review Application No. 74-CII of 2016 in
C.M No. 24175 of 2015 in
Civil Revision No. 5883 of 2015**

:1:

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

*** * * * ***

**Review Application No. 74-CII of 2016 in
C.M No. 24175 of 2015 in
Civil Revision No. 5883 of 2015
Date of decision : April 05, 2016**

*** * * * ***

Mrs. Harinder Ghuman

.....Petitioner

Versus

Mr. Paramjit Singh Dhillon and others

.....Respondents

*** * * * ***

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

*** * * * ***

Present: Mrs. Harinder Ghuman, Petitioner in person.

*** * * * ***

1. *Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

RITU BAHRI, J

C.M No. 5805-CII of 2016

For the reasons mentioned in the application, delay of five days in filing the present review application is condoned.

C.M is allowed.

**Review Application No. 74-CII of 2016 in
**C.M No. 24175 of 2015 in
Civil Revision No. 5883 of 2015****

Petitioner in person is seeking review of the order dated 12.01.2016 passed by this Court in C.M NO. 24175 of 2015 in Civil Revision No. 5883 of 2015, whereby an application for recalling the order dated 09.09.2015 and for restoration of Civil Revision No.5883

**Review Application No. 74-CII of 2016 in
C.M No. 24175 of 2015 in
Civil Revision No. 5883 of 2015**

:2:

of 2015 had been dismissed by following the judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of ***"T.N Electricity Board and another vs. N. Raju Reddiar and another"*, 1997 AIR (SC) 1005.**

The petitioner has argued that the counsel who had appeared on 12.1.2016 had obtained a no objection certificate from the earlier counsel and as such the application should not have been dismissed.

Though, a perusal of the judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in ***T.N Electricity Board's case (supra)*** shows that not obtaining the consent of the earlier counsel/Advocate was one of the grounds for not entertaining the review application, but the practice of changing Advocates in filing repeated review petitions should be deprecated for purity of administration of law and salutary and healthy practice. Hence, merely because the counsel had taken a no objection from the earlier counsel can not be a ground to review the order dated 12.1.2016.

Having regard to the aforesaid, present review application is dismissed.

April 05, 2016
ritu

**(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE**