

267.

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

Civil Revision No.6555 of 2017

Date of decision:24.01.2018

GOVIND RAM

... Petitioner

versus

SHIV KUMAR

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present: Mr.R.S. Sangwan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

HARI PAL VERMA, J.(Oral)

Petitioner has filed the present revision petition impugning the order dated 23.01.2014 (Annexure P-1) passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Mahendergarh as well as the order dated 19.04.2017 (Annexure P-3) passed by learned Additional District Judge, Narnaul.

Vide order dated 23.01.2014, learned Civil Judge had dismissed the petition filed by the petitioner-plaintiff under Order 39 Rule 2A read with Section 151 CPC, whereas vide order dated 19.04.2017, learned Additional District Judge had dismissed the appeal filed against the order dated 23.01.2014.

The petition filed by the petitioner-plaintiff under Order 39 Rule 2A as well as the appeal filed before the Additional District Judge, Narnaul were dismissed by the courts below with an observation that when a suit is decided, all interlocutory orders comes to an end, as the aforesaid orders were passed in the pending suit. Reliance has been placed by

the learned Additional District Judge on the judgment passed in **Municipal**

**Corporation of Gr Mumbai and others Versus Bhikanlal Nanakchand
Sharma-2007(3) Civil Court Cases 449.**

There is no serious dispute about the proposition of law. When a suit is dismissed, all interlocutory orders merge into it and, therefore, there is no illegality in the order passed by the courts below.

Dismissed.

**(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE**

24.01.2018

sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No.

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No.