

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

**C.R. No.8826 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision.14.01.2016**

Amrit Kaur	Vs.	Petitioner
General Public and others		Respondents

Present: Mr. D.K. Bhatti, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

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?

-.-

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. The suit filed without notice under Section 80 CPC to the State and its functionary came to be rejected. The plaintiff wants to make an argument that purpose of Section 80 is to bring the attention of the State to act and he had given several representations to the State. Representation is not a notice in the manner contemplated under Section 80 CPC. There is no exception possible. If, according to the plaintiff, there is urgency of an interim order, it shall be best for him to invoke provisions under Section 80 itself seeking for such permission to be granted by the Court. The suit instituted without notice by making reference to the representation is not correct and rejection of the plaint was justified.
2. I will find no reason for intervention. The revision petition is dismissed but with liberty to the plaintiff to adopt such procedure as is legally tenable.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

January 14, 2016
Pankaj*