

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

C.R.No.6970 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: April 21st, 2016

Mandeep Kaur & another

...Petitioners

Versus

Jasbir Kaur

...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.D.K.Bhatti, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr.A.S.Gill, Advocate,
for the respondent.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

By the impugned order, the defence of the petitioner-defendants was struck off, whereas during the interregnum, a subsequent event has taken place, whereby the petitioner-defendants have been proceeded ex-parte. When confronted with this situation, Mr.Bhatti on the last date of hearing, had sought adjournment.

It has been informed that the aforementioned facts are correct. In view of such situation, the discussion on the order under challenge would be totally redundant, much less otiose for the reason that in case this Court comes to a conclusion that the petitioner-defendants be granted one opportunity to file the written statement, would tantamount to setting-aside of the ex-parte order. The remedy, if any, for the petitioner-defendants is to

move an appropriate application seeking setting-aside of ex-parte order and

thereafter seek the remedy in accordance with law. Liberty to challenge the impugned order, at an appropriate stage, is accordingly granted.

With the aforementioned observations, the petition is rendered infructuous and disposed of as such.

April 21st, 2016
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE