

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

130

CR No.7323 of 2017

Date of decision :26.10.2017

Malayan Banking Berhad

...Petitioner

Versus

Kay Vee Impex and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Paras Money Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (Oral)

Although, normally this Court does not interfere with the working of the Civil Court. However, certain facts which have been brought to the notice of this Court compel this Court to pass this order.

Petitioner before me is a defendant in a suit, which is pending before the Court since the year 2012. There is an interim order operating in favour of the plaintiff. Defendant-petitioner earlier also filed similar revision petition i.e. CR No.8137 of 2015, which was disposed of by this Court hoping that the applications shall be disposed of and no undue adjournment shall be granted. However, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that till date application under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 has not been disposed of.

Taking into consideration the aforesaid facts, the Civil Judge is directed to decide the application under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 on the next date of hearing i.e. 06.11.2017. However, if there are compelling circumstances, the Court shall not adjourn the case beyond a period of one week.

With these directions, the revision petition is disposed of.

26.10.2017
sheetal

**(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: Yes
Whether Reportable : No