

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

**CR No.2011 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of decision : March 27, 2018**

Smt. Nirmal Gaur

..... Petitioner

Versus

Smt. Sarabjit Kaur and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Vivek Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the present petitioner is the plaintiff-respondent No.1 in the appeal pending before the learned Addl. District Judge, Kurukshetra. The others are proforma respondents.

It is stated that on 09.12.2017, learned counsel for respondent No.1 was not present but his presence was wrongly marked and on account of no objection by the respondents, who are proforma respondents, operation of the impugned judgment and decree was stayed till the disposal of the appeal and the case has now been listed for 10.08.2018 for arguments, which is a long date.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that he will be satisfied if the appeal is ordered to be decided within three months by pre-poning the same.

As such, the present revision petition is disposed of with a direction to the learned Addl. District Judge, Kurukshetra, where the appeal

is pending to pre-pone the appeal and list the same on 05.04.2018 and thereafter, dispose of the same within three months after hearing learned counsel for the parties.

Since the main revision petition has been disposed of, therefore, the pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

March 27, 2018

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No