

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

Rajnish WadheraPetitioner
Vs
Rashme Bahl and othersRespondents

[2]. Perusal of para no.4 of the impugned order would show that the trial Court has only observed that two separate

applications on behalf of defendant No.3 were filed with the prayers including therein and the trial Court after hearing learned counsel for the parties thought it appropriate to allow the applications.

[3]. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that no notice in the aforesaid applications was issued to the petitioner, nor any reply was filed.

[4]. The impugned order in my considered view is totally non-speaking. At this stage, without embarking upon merits of the case, I deem it appropriate to set aside the impugned order and remand the case to the trial Court with a direction to pass a fresh order in both the applications after issuing notice to the petitioner. The trial Court shall decide the applications on merit without being influenced by any statement of fact recorded hereinabove. The interest of defendant No.3/respondent No.1 viz-a-viz. her brother shall also be taken into consideration on merits. It would also be appreciated, if the trial Court makes positive endeavour to decide the applications as well as the main suit on some earlier date by giving short adjournments.

[5]. With the aforesaid observation, this revision petition is disposed of.

September 20, 2019

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Atik

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No