

235

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

1. **Civil Revision No.977 of 2017 (O&M)**
Date of Decision: 18.03.2019

Ritu Rani @ Reetu RaniPetitioner
Vs
Anita Rani and anotherRespondents

2. **Civil Revision No.1032 of 2017 (O&M)**

Ritu Rani @ Reetu RaniPetitioner
Vs
UCO Bank and othersRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present:Mr. Siddharth Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Nonish Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate
for the respondents.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

[1]. Vide this common order CR Nos.977 and 1032 of 2017 (O&M) are being disposed of. Since both the petitions involve similar controversy, therefore, for brevity facts are being culled out from CR No.977 of 2017 (O&M).

[2]. Petitioner has challenged the order dated 12.07.2016 passed by the Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.) Bathinda vide which the application filed by the defendants under Order 7 Rules 10 and 11 CPC has been allowed and the plaint has been returned to

the plaintiff for its presentation before the competent Court at Abohar.

[3]. Brief facts of the case are that an FIR No.177 dated 25.11.2011 was lodged in the police station at Abohar. Plaintiff/petitioner was arrested at Bathinda as a consequence of said FIR. The suit for recovery of damages was filed at Bathinda. Admittedly, the FIR was registered at police Station Abohar. Defendants are also residents of Abohar and they carry on their business in District Abohar. Arrest of the petitioner was a consequent action after registration of FIR at Abohar.

[4]. In view of Section 19 CPC, the suit for compensation for wrong done to the person or to movable property was filed within the local limits of Abohar. Defendants are also residents of Abohar and they carry on their business and personally work for gain within the local limits of jurisdiction of Court at Abohar.

[5]. In view of aforesaid legal position, the cause of action in terms of Section 19 CPC would accrue to the plaintiff at Abohar for which the indulgence granted by the trial Court/Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.) Bathinda cannot be faulted with. Consequently, both the revision petitions are found to be devoid of merits and are accordingly dismissed.

March 18, 2019

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Atik

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No