

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

**CR-5232-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 14.08.2018**

Murti Shri Shankar Bhagwan, Sonapat ... Appellant

Versus

Mukesh ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present: Mr. Alok Mittal, Advocate for the petitioner.

...
TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (ORAL)

The instant revision petition is directed against the order dated 11.04.2018, whereby an application moved by the present petitioner/landlord seeking restoration of the appeal has been declined .

2. I have heard Mr. Alok Mittal, Advocate representing the petitioner at length.

3. The uncontroverted factual position is that appeal filed by the petitioner against rejection of the ejectment petition was dismissed by the Appellate Authority on 27.05.2015 for non-prosecution. The application preferred by the petitioner/landlord seeking restoration of the appeal was filed on 20.09.2016 i.e. after a period of 1 year, 3 months and 22 days. Counsel does not dispute that under the Limitation Act, 1963, an application for restoration was to be filed within a period of 30 days from the date of dismissal. Concededly, no application for condonation of delay had been filed.

4. In view of the factual premise noticed herein above, this Court does not find any patent infirmity in the impugned order dated 11.04.2018 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Sonapat and which would

warrant interference by this Court in exercise of its revisional jurisdiction.

Petition is dismissed.

14.08.2018

harjeet

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |