

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

Civil Revision No.2594 of 2016

Date of Decision: May 04, 2016

Gurmail Singh Aulakh & another

...Petitioners

Versus

Imperial Crop Care Pvt.Limited, New Delhi

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL, JUDGE

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?

Present: Mr.Deepak Aggarwal, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

Petitioner-plaintiffs are aggrieved of the impugned order, whereby the appeal filed against the judgment and decree dated 26.2.2015, has been dismissed by invoking the provisions of Order 9 Rule 2 of the Civil Procedure Code.

Mr.Deepak Aggarwal, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-plaintiffs submits that the impugned order was passed without effecting service upon the respondent-defendant on account of non-filing of the registered cover and, thus, urges this Court that in case one opportunity is granted, the petitioners will do the needful.

Keeping in view the aforementioned facts and circumstances, the impugned order is set-aside. The appeal is restored to its original number. The Lower Appellate Court is directed to afford one opportunity to the petitioner-plaintiffs to file the registered cover.

The petitioners are directed to appear before the Lower
Appellate Court on 27.5.2016.

Revision petition stands allowed.

May 04, 2016
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE