

107+248

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

CR No. 8241 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 29.05.2019

Harvinder Jeet Singh Sekhon

-Petitioner

Vs

Country Colonisers Private Limited and others

-Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Petitioner in person.

Mrs. Munisha Gandhi, Sr. Advocate, with
Mr. Viraj Gandhi, Advocate, and
Mr. Amitabh Sinha, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.

Mr. G.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate,
for respondent No.4.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

CM-12285-CII-2019

The present application has been filed for initiation of proceedings under Contempt of Courts Act.

Reference has been made to the words used in para no.8 of the reply. The words used in the reply may give rise to different interpretation. Even learned counsel for respondent No.1 showed gesture of feeling sorry to the petitioner on 25.05.2019 if at all his feelings are hurt.

In view of above, this application does not require any further adjudication.

Disposed of.

Main case

1. This revision petition has been preferred against the order dated 24.09.2018 passed by Civil Judge (Senior Division), S.A.S. Nagar, Mohali vide which the petitioner was not allowed to address arguments in person.

2. The background of the case is that the lawyer engaged by the petitioner did not turn up to attend the case and the Court was of the opinion that the petitioner should avail the benefit of Legal Aid Counsel.

3. Petitioner in person by relying upon Section 32 of the Advocates Act coupled with Order 3 Rule 1 CPC and Article 19 (g) of the Constitution of India states that plaintiff in person can represent his cause in a suit. He relies upon **Goa Antibiotic and Pharmaceuticals Ltd. vs Chawla, 2011(4) RCR (Civil) 257** and **Harishankar Rastogi vs Girdhari Sharma and another, 1978 AIR (SC) 1019** in the aforesaid context.

4. Owing to the situation in which the impugned order has been passed, petitioner craves indulgence of this Court for transferring the pending case before the trial Court to some other Court of competent jurisdiction.

5. During course of arguments, it transpires that the Presiding Officer of the trial Court has already been transferred. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 could not oppose the prayer of the petitioner to address arguments in person with reference to any case law as the matter is squarely between the petitioner and the Court.

6. Looking to the controversy, I accept this revision petition. Petitioner is permitted to represent his cause in the pending suit. Keeping in view the pendency of the suit before the trial Court for a considerable time, the trial Court shall make every endeavour to decide the suit expeditiously by giving short adjournments.

29.05.2019

Jyoti Yadav

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

2. Whether reportable : Yes/No