

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

**RA-CR 134-CII of 2011 in
CR 544 of 2011**

Date of Decision: April 19, 2017

Harkirat Singh Mangat

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Inderjit Singh

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI.

-. -

**Present:- Mr. Harkirat Singh Mangat, petitioner in person
Mr. Sharad Aggarwal, Advocate for the applicant.**

-. -

M.M.S. BEDI, J.

This order will dispose of review application No.-CR-134 of 2011 for review of order dated August 18, 2011 passed in CR No. 544 of 2011 and Misc. Application No.2243 of 2011. The main grievance of the petitioner is that he could not attend the Court on August 18, 2011 and render assistance to this Court to arrive at correct decision and that his misc. application No. 2244 of 2011 remains un-disposed.

I have gone through the entire record of CR No. 544 of 2011 which was filed along with application under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC i.e. CM 2243-CII of 2011 with the above said revision petition. Second CM No. 2244-CII of 2011 is an application for stay of the order passed by Civil

Judge (Senior Division), Ludhiana passed on August 28, 2010. The petitioner is under misconceived notion that CM No. 2244-CII of 2011 for staying the operation of the impugned order has not been considered.

It is pertinent to mention here that CR 544 of 2011 had been disposed of by this Court along with Misc. applications. CM No. 2243-CII of 2011 is an application under Order 1 Rule 10 CPC for impleading Rohit Thapar, Advocate as a party to the revision petition. The said misc. application 2243-CII of 2011 has been specifically dealt with by Permod Kohli, J., by a judicial order taking into consideration the contents of the application. It is also not out of place to mention here that Rohit Thapar had been impleaded as respondent No.1 in the revision petition and while passing an order dated March 28, 2011, this Court had passed an order to delete the name of Rohit Thapar-respondent No.1 as he was not a party before the lower Court. In the order dated January 27, 2011, which has been reviewed by subsequent orders, the application for impleading Rohit Thapar as party had been dismissed.

Taking into consideration all the above said circumstances, no ground is made out to pass any fresh order as all the pleas have already been considered in various orders passed by this Court. The rights of the petitioner to effect recoveries on account of damages having been caused by lessee had been safeguarded while disposing of the main revision petition. The petitioner has already been delivered possession of his property. This Court finds no reason to review the orders earlier passed. Taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is an old retired District Attorney, maximum indulgence has been shown in his case even by referring the

matter to the mediation by a Coordinate Bench. All the claims of the petitioner having already been decided by this Court, his earlier two review applications having been decided, no further adjudication is required on the merit or misc. application.

Dismissed.

April 19, 2017
sanjay

(M.M.S.BEDI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/ reasoned:	Yes/ No.
Whether reportable:	Yes/No.