

206.

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

Civil Revision No.6165 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of decision: 23.12.2015

HT Media Limited and others

... Petitioners

versus

Prof. K.K. Bhutani and others.

.... Respondents

II. Civil Revision No.6205 of 2014 (O&M)

HT Media Limited and others

... Petitioners

versus

Wing Commander (Retd.) PJP Singh Waraich, and others.

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. Atul Gaur, Advocate,
for Mr. Sumeet Goel, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. G.S. Puri, Advocate,
for the respondents.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ? No.
2. To be referred to the reporters or not ?No.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?No.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

1. Both the revisions are connected and they are disposed

of by a common order.

2. The written statement has not filed in spite of opportunities given and within 90 days or within the further extended period. The costs as directed were also not paid. The grounds of revision are deficient in not setting out the reasons as to why the statement could not be filed or why costs could not be paid. With all such deficits, if a party is willing to file a written statement, I will receive the same but for the indiscretion on the part of the revision petitioners in taunting the plaintiff and keeping the plaintiff guessing as to what the defendants are going to say, I impose costs of ₹25,000/- in aggregate in both cases to be paid by the petitioners to the plaintiffs. The costs shall be paid within 4 weeks, failing which, the statement received by this court will be taken as eschewed and the defence struck off. The statement received by this court is transmitted to the trial court for taking them on record, framing issues and then proceed in accordance with law.

3. Revision petitions are allowed on the above terms.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

23.12.2015
sanjeev