

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V. BHATT
CIVIL REVISION PETITION No.884 of 2013

ORDER:

The defendant in O.S.No.94 of 2009 in the court of Senior Civil Judge at Miryalaguda is the revision petitioner. The plaintiffs filed I.A.No.729 of 2012 seeking review of the order dated 18.07.2012 in I.A.No.68 of 2012 and to appoint an Advocate Commissioner. The Court below, after hearing both sides, allowed I.A.No.729 of 2012 on 28.01.2013. Aggrieved thereby, the defendant filed the present revision.

Heard Mr. Solman for petitioner and Mr. Bankatlal Mandhani for respondent. Perused the record.

Scope of review is well defined and though a few submissions are made by Mr. Solman to convince the Court that the order passed in I.A.No.729 of 2012 is untenable, after perusing the order under revision, I am satisfied that taking note of the grounds of review, the learned Judge has considered whether the jurisdiction of the Court under Order XLVII Rule 1 of C.P.C is attracted or not, and allowed I.A.No.729 of 2012 within the scope of review and I do not find any reason to interfere with the same.

The revision fails and is, accordingly, dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, stand closed.

S.V. BHATT, J