

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-A-328 MA-2013 (O&M)

Date of decision: 05.05.2016

Suresh Kumar

.....Applicant

versus

R.K.Nehra and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Kuldip Singh

Present: Mr.Maharaj Kumar, Advocate for the applicant
None for the respondents

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

Kuldip Singh, J. (Oral)

CRM No. 30085 of 2013

For the reasons mentioned in the application, it is allowed and 21 days delay in filing the application for grant of leave to appeal stands condoned.

CRM-A-328 MA-2013

Lower Court record received. The perusal of the complaint shows that grouse of the complainant is that accused No.1 firm i.e. Parific Projects Limited had allotted a contract to M/s M.R.S. Construction Company, in which, the present complainant was a partner. It is stated that the accused company withdrew the contract from the firm M/s M.R.S. Construction Company and allotted the same to some other company in connivance with accused No.2. In

this way, the complainant has been cheated. The allegations of threat were also levelled.

I have heard learned counsel for the applicant and have carefully gone through the file.

It comes out that lower court has disbelieved the story of giving intimidation. The facts stated above show that it is a case where contract was allotted to the firm, in which, the complainant was a partner. Then the company withdrew the contract from the said firm and allotted the same to some other company.

I concur with the view taken by the lower Court that basically it is a civil dispute and if some loss has been caused to the complainant or his company, he can always seek damages.

No ground to interfere.

Hence, the present application for grant of leave to appeal stands dismissed.

05.05.2016
gk

(Kuldip Singh)
Judge