

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

ARCHANA ARORA
15:23
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

CR No. 1054 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : February 11, 2016

Gugan Singh Hooda

..... Petitioner

Versus

Northern Railway, New Delhi and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. N. K. Malhotra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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?

Amit Rawal, J (oral).

The petitioner-plaintiff is aggrieved against the order dated 15.5.2013 whereby suit for recovery for an amount of ₹500/- has been dismissed.

As per the amendment caused in the Code of Civil Procedure, Regular Second Appeal in respect of an amount less than ₹25,000/- is not maintainable. Once the statutory provisions prohibits the same, the party cannot circumvent the same by filing a revision petition.

The revision petition is wholly mis-conceived and the same is accordingly dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

February 11 , 2016
archana