

112 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No.929 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of decision : February 14, 2018

Bhag Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Netar Singh and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. P.S. Paul, 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)

Heard.

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 01.11.2017 (Annexure P-2) passed by learned Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.), Rupnagar, vide which an application filed by the present petitioner for consolidation of two cases of same title, titled as “*Netar Singh vs Bhag Singh*” was dismissed. It comes that one suit is for permanent injunction and other is for declaration. It was stated that the parties are same and the property involved is also same.

A perusal of the impugned order shows that in one case, the evidence of the plaintiff is concluded. However, in the other case, the evidence is yet to begin. The present petitioner remained silent and when the evidence of one party was concluded in one case, the present application was filed. If the cases are consolidated, that would mean that *de novo* trial will start in one case. Therefore, there is no ground to consolidate both the cases at this stage. However, the trial court is directed to make an endeavour

to conclude the evidence in second case expeditiously, so as to bring the same at par with the first case and then make an endeavour to dispose of both the cases simultaneously, either through single judgment or separate judgments.

As such, the present revision petition is disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

February 14, 2018

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No