

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

CR-869-2021(O&M)

Date of decision:08.04.2021

Ishwar Dayal Sehgal and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Sunita Chattly

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present:- Mr.A.K.Kansal, Advocate for the petitioners

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (ORAL)

The defendants have filed this revision petition against an interlocutory order passed by the Civil Judge (Junior Division), Panchkula, dismissing an application for rejection of the plaint under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC.

The first objection of the defendants is that the plaintiff has not affixed proper court fee. Learned Civil Judge, Junior Division, Panchkula, has found that the proper court fee has been affixed. Still further, no further appeal or revision at the hands of the defendants is maintainable in view of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**Sri Rathnavaramaraja vs. Smt. Vimla**' AIR 1961 SC 1299.

Next argument of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the plaint is not drafted in accordance with Order 7 Rule 1 (i).

In the considered view of this Court, this matter can be examined by the court while finally adjudicating the suit. Hence, no

ground to exercise jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is made out.

Dismissed.

08.04.2021

rekha

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether Reportable

Yes /No

Yes / No

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE