

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.

CR 624 of 2020

Date of Decision: February 10, 2020

Kotak Mahindra Bank

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Sanjay Kumar Tyagi and anr.

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU.

-. -

Present:- Mr.Pawan, Advocate for
Mr. Nitin Thatai, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr.Abhinav Sood, Advocate for
Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for respondent No.1.
None for respondent No.2, despite service through his
counsel in terms of the order dated 29.01.2020, of this
Court.

-. -

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present petition has been filed under Article 227 of the
Constitution of India for directing learned trial Court to decide the
application under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC within some time bound
manner.

The prayer of the petitioner has been vehemently
opposed by learned counsel for respondent No.1 on the ground that
on last two occasions, adjournments were requested on behalf of the
present petitioner before learned Civil Judge (Junior Division),
Panipat.

Heard both sides and perused the paper book.

Although this Court will not issue a mandate to the
learned trial Court to decide the pending application under Order 7
Rule 11 CPC, in a time bound manner, but at the same time, in view

of the nature of the lis, it would be appropriate to proceed in the matter expeditiously without granting any unnecessary adjournments to either of the parties.

Consequently, the present petition is disposed off with a request to learned trial Court to dispose off the application under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC expeditiously, according to law, if there is no legal impediment.

February 10, 2020
sanjay

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/ reasoned:	Yes/ No.
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No.