

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

C.R. No.8870 of 2015

Date of Decision.05.01.2016

Neeraj Kamra

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Rajesh Sharma

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Vivek Gupta, 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 revision petition is against the order returning the plaint to be presented at Khanna where the property is situate. The counsel argued that the suit is not for property but only for money and the suit could be instituted where the parties reside. The cause of action for recovery of money could be in a place where the document is written. There is no reference any where in the plaint disclosing the place of cause of action in suit that the document was written at Nabha. There is no averment in the plaint, plaint suffers from a failure to disclose the cause of action for institution of suit at Nabha. That itself could be enough ground for the rejection of plaint under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC or direct return of the plaint to be made at the place of jurisdiction manifest in the document. I will make no intervention.

2. The revision petition is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

January 05, 2016
Pankaj*