

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

117

**Civil Revision No.8136 of 2015(O & M)
Date of Decision:02.12.2015**

HSBC Amanah Malaysia Berhad

....petitioner

Versus

Millennium Wires Pvt. Ltd. and others

.....respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

- 1.Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgement?**
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?**

Present: Mr.Paras Money Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner

ARUN PALLI, J.(ORAL):-

Vide this petition, filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, a direction is being prayed for, to the trial Court i.e.Court of Ms.Parminder Kaur, Civil Judge (Junior Divn.), Jalandhar, to dispose of all interim applications moved by the petitioner, in Civil Suit No.33 of 2012, filed by respondent No.1.

It is maintained that the petitioner i.e. HSBC Amanah Malaysia Berhad is a foreign bank. Respondent No.1 (plaintiff) had entered into a contract with Synergic Industrial Material Services PTE Limited, Malaysia (respondent No.3). Respondent No.1 (plaintiff) is the buyer and respondent No.3 is the seller. Pursuant to the said contract, respondent No.1 requested Oriental Bank of Commerce, Jalandhar (respondent No.2) to issue three Letters of Credit and as a result, respondent No.2 opened three Letters of Credit, details whereof, form part of the record. As the said Letters of Credit were

available for negotiation with any bank in Malaysia, and it was specifically recited that on receipt of documents, the issuing bank (respondent No.2) shall reimburse the amounts to the negotiating bank (petitioner) on its due date. Thus, the petitioner is the Negotiating Bank in the transaction.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that vide an ex parte order of injunction dated 10.04.2012 (Annexure P3), the trial Court had injuncted defendant No.1 (respondent No.2) from releasing any amount to the petitioner and respondents No.3 and 4, and the said order is operational to date, though, petitioner had filed its written statement as also an application for vacation of stay on 03.05.2013 and an application for rejection of the plaint on 03.04.2014. It is contended that the matter has been listed before the Court on more than 20 occasions and has only been heard in part. So much so, even the written submissions have been placed on record, in support of the pending applications, moved by the petitioner. Apparently, it is contended that the matter is being prolonged at the instance of the plaintiff. Not just that, on 31.08.2015 and 18.09.2015, the matter was indeed adjourned, pursuant to the request for adjournment by counsel for the plaintiff, but the proceedings recorded by the Court, indicate that the hearing was deferred pursuant to the joint request of the parties. It is urged that indecision is severely affecting the interest of the petitioner, as a period of more than 3 & ½ years have gone by since passing of the ex parte order of injunction.

For, trial Court, is in seisin of the dispute and its

proceedings, in the normal parlance, this Court would have refrained from directing the trial Court to decide the pending applications, within a specified time, but in the wake of the above noticed position, this Court is impelled to direct the trial Court to proceed, strictly, in accordance with law and decide all pending applications, as expeditiously as possible. Needless to assert, no undue adjournment shall be granted.

Revision petition is disposed of, in above terms. Needless to mention, that this order shall not constitute any expression of opinion on merits of the claim of either party.

02.12.2015

neenu

**(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE**