

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

CR No.4128 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision : 14.07.2016

Punjab National Bank

...Petitioner

Versus

M/s Punjab Agro Food Grain Corporation Ltd. and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL.

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment ?
2. To be referred to reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present: Mr. Arvind Rajotia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anupam Singla, Advocate for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

On 17.06.2016, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that civil suit (Annexure P-6) along with an application for stay claiming declaration to the effect that the petitioner-plaintiff is hypothecatee of hypothecated goods and for permanent injunction restraining the defendant Nos.1 and 2 from opening E-tenders, was filed during the vacations but the Vacation Judge declined to entertain the suit in vacations by dismissing the application and ordered to be put up on 01.07.2016. He has also drawn the attention of this Court to the auction notice (Annexure P-5), whereby tenders are to be opened at 2.00 P.M today itself, i.e., 17.06.2016. There is a categoric averment supported by the documents showing urgency and even the reasons assigned are

lacking cogent reasons.

Notice of motion for 14.07.2016.

In the meantime, auction/opening of the tenders shall remain stayed till 12th July, 2016.

Liberty is granted to the petitioner to move an application for stay and press the same on the date fixed before the trial Court.

A photocopy of this order be given dasti to the learned counsel for the petitioner under the signatures of the Reader of this Court.”

It has been brought to the notice of this Court by Mr. Anupam Singla, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent Nos.1 and 2 that revision petition has become infructuous as vacation are over.

Mr. Rajotia, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that next date before the trial Court is 22.07.2016. In view of such position, I am of the view that revision petition can be disposed of with direction to trial Court to decide the interim application within a period of one month purported to have been filed along with the suit, as the pleadings except replication are already complete.

Replication if any, be filed before the next date of hearing with advance copy to the opposite counsel, the interim order granted by this Court shall be in operation till the disposal of application seeking ad-interim.

Revision petition stands disposed of in the aforementioned terms.

14.07.2016

pawan

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**